This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google books

https://books.google.com

THE LIBRARY

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

OMNIBUS ARTIBUS COMMUNE VINCULUM

Periodical Collection

CLASS

BOOK

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

"NOT THE WISDOM OF THIS WORLD."—1 COR. II. 6.

SCIANT IGITUR, QUI PROPHETAS NON INTELLIGUNT, NEC SCIRE DESIDERANT,
ASSERENTES SE TANTUM EVANGELIO ESSE CONTENTOS,
CHRISTI NESCIRE MYSTERIUM.

JEROME IN EP. AD EPH.

VOL. IV. 1852

LONDON:
JAMES NISBET AND CO., 21, BERNERS STREET.
1852.

Digitized by Google

ALEXANDER MACINTOSH,
PRINTER,
GREAT NEW-STREET, LONDON.

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

JANUARY, 1852.

ART. I.—SINAITIC INSCRIPTIONS.*

It is well known that the whole Sinaitic region abounds with inscriptions. These occur, with small breaks, along the whole line of an extensive valley, named from this fact, *Wady Mokatteb*, or the written valley. They are to be found also covering the face of a neighbouring mountain, hence called *Djebel Mokatteb*, or the written mountain.

Of these inscriptions there are *thousands*. Probably they are much more numerous and widely scattered than is yet known; for several parts, where they are likely to be found, have not been visited. They extend for *miles*, according to the unanimous testimony of travellers; and if wider research be set on foot, they will, in all likelihood, be found to spread over many miles more, and to cover the numerous smaller valleys as extensively as they do the Wady Mokatteb. They occur almost exclusively on the direct road from Sinai to Suez and Egypt, and not on any of the routes from Arabia Petrea to Sinai. The only exception to this is the Wady Arabah, regarding which we merely at present remark that it is in the line of Israel's March from Egypt.

They are seen in every conceivable situation; on the loose fragments that strew the valley; on the rocks that rise upon its slopes; on lofty cliffs, utterly inaccessible save by the

* "The One Primeval Language, traced experimentally through ancient inscriptions in alphabetic characters of lost powers from the four Continents; including the Voice of Israel from the Rocks of Sinai; and the vestiges of patriarchal tradition from the Monuments of Egypt, Etruria, and Southern Arabia. With Illustrative Plates, a Harmonized Table of Alphabets, Glossaries, and Translations. By the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D." London: Richard Bentley, New Burlington-street. 1851.

671746

Digitized by Google

ladder or the rope; on the granite precipices of Mount Serbal, and on the sandstone of Mokatteb; sometimes scratched, sometimes graven, sometimes dotted, sometimes stained.* The labour bestowed upon them must have been enormous, and they could only have been executed by men who had no lack of time or tools. It is almost needless to add that they must have been the fruit of the united labour of *multitudes*, and multitudes well stored with provisions and well supplied with water; as otherwise they could not have remained in the desert for a single day. It is of importance to add that they must *have been the work of a single generation.* This is proved by the entire sameness of character and general style of workmanship, so that this point is admitted, even by those, such as Professor Beer, whose theories of their origin would have demanded a longer period for their execution.†

These inscriptions were first discovered in the beginning of the sixth century. Cosmas, an Alexandrian merchant, called Indicopleustes from his voyages to India, traversed on foot the Sinaitic peninsula. From a bustling traveller he became a quiet monk, and in the leisure of monastic solitude wrote his "Christian Topography," a book, absurd enough in its astronomical speculations, but faithful in its details of fact. "Cosmas," says Dr. Robertson, "seems to relate what he himself had observed in his travels, or what he had learned from others, with great simplicity and regard for truth."‡ In that work is contained his narrative respecting these inscriptions. To his eye they appeared of great antiquity and of an unknown character. Many of them were on fragments of rocks which had rolled down from the cliffs, and these fragments were evidently old, one after another having in the lapse of ages found its way into the valley. From the fact that on some of these pieces the inscriptions were found *inverted*, it is plain that they must have been executed while the rocks were in their original position on the cliff.

It would seem that there were some Jews with Cosmas, whom he had fallen in with on his journey, or who had

* Pococke, who copied many of them, says, "I observed that most of them were not cut, but stained, making the granite of a lighter colour, and when the stone had scaled, I could see the stain had sunk into the stone."—"Travels," vol. i., p. 148. Besides the inscriptions, there are figures of men and animals, particularly the camel and the ass.

† "Scripturæ ratio interna tam est uniformis, ut antiquissimas earum a recentissimis intervallo quod seculum multum excedat, dubitem."—(Beer, quoted by Forster, p. 33.)

‡ Robertson's History of India, sect. ii.

Digitized by Google

accompanied him in his tour. They read the inscriptions to him, and gave him the traditional account of the way in which they were executed. They told him that the authors of the inscriptions were their forefathers when sojourning in the desert. Cosmas evidently had no doubt that the account thus given was the true one. He relates it as such; and, no doubt, the *appearance* of the writings commended the account of these Jews, and corroborated this tradition of their venerable antiquity. Had they been of recent origin, even within a few centuries back, their appearance would have detected them, as, in that region, sharpness of outline would be preserved for ages, whereas it would appear that extreme age marked them all.

From the sixth to the sixteenth century we hear nothing of these inscriptions. About the middle of the sixteenth century, Peter Belon, or Bellonius as he latinizes his name, a Paris physician, seems to have visited Arabia, and afterwards, in the year 1554, published a quarto volume in French, on the memorable things to be found in different countries of the East. Amongst these he refers to the Sinaitic inscriptions.

About a century after, Athanasius Kircher, a German antiquary, wrote his work "Œdipus Ægyptiacus," in which he takes up the inscriptions under notice. It was published at Rome in 1652.

A few years after Balthasar Monconys, a French traveller, visited Arabia, and published his remarks on these writings in 1665.*

In 1706, Montfaucon published the work of Cosmas with a Latin version and notes.† In editing this he bears high testimony to the trustworthiness of Cosmas, giving implicit credit to his facts, and pronouncing him *fide dignus ac sincerus scriptor si quis alius.* At the same time, though without any reason given, he sneers at the idea of the Hebrew origin of the writings, giving it, as his opinion, that Cosmas was deceived by the lies of the Jews, *Hebraeorum mendacio deceptum.* The reader may attach what weight he pleases to

* The translator of Niebuhr has turned this name into *Momonys*, (vol. i., p. 201), just as the translator of Laborde has turned *Kircher* into *Kirsha.*—p. 250.

† Montfaucon's work was entitled "Collectio nova Patrum Græcorum, Eusebii Cæsariensis, Athanasii et Cosmæ Ægyptii. Gr. et Lat. cum notis." Paris. 1706. Two vols., folio. Mr. Forster gives 1707 as the year when Montfaucon published Cosmas. But if the "Dictionnaire Bibliographique" be correct, it was a year earlier. See vol. i., p. 67, "Athanasius."

Digitized by Google

this dictum of the learned antiquary. It will not, we should suppose, convince any one of aught save the Frenchman's determination not to admit the antiquity of the inscriptions.

In the year 1722, the Prefetto of the Franciscans at Cairo made a journey to Sinai, in company with some missionaries of the Cairo Propaganda. On his way back he passed through the Wady Mokatteb, and gives a description of the writings, much as Cosmas had done. As to the interpretation of them he was totally at a loss. "We had in our company," says he, "persons who were acquainted with the Arabic, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Armenian, Turkish, English, Illyrican, German, and Bohemian languages, yet none of them had any knowledge of these characters, which have, nevertheless, been *cut into the hard rock*, with the greatest industry, in a place *where there is neither water nor anything to be gotten to eat*." His opinion of them is, that "they contain some very secret mysteries, and were engraved either by the Chaldeans or *some other persons, long before the coming of Christ*."

In 1737, Pococke visited the region. His description of these engravings is very brief, but he has copied many of them, and given us two large plates containing what he copied. These are exceedingly valuable, more especially as he gives the exact place and rock from which he copied each.

Shortly after an English gentleman, Charles Thomson, visited the place, and remarks, "there are abundance of other inscriptions on the stones about these mountains, but as they are in a very ancient character, void of beauty, and absolutely unintelligible, I thought the pains of copying them might very well be spared." *

In the year 1753, Robert Clayton, Bishop of Clogher, translated and published the Journal of the Franciscan Prefetto, already referred to, with remarks on the origin of Hieroglyphics. This work seems to have occasioned more speculation and called up more interest than any of the preceding, especially as he offered the sum of five hundred pounds to any one who would undertake the journey to Arabia, and bring back copies of the inscriptions. He states it as his opinion that "these characters are the ancient Hebrew characters, which the Israelites, having learnt to write at the time of the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, diverted themselves with practising on these mountains during their forty years' abode in the wilderness."

Shortly after Edward Wortley Montague travelled from

* "Travels," vol. iii., p. 363. They were published in 1744.

Digitized by Google

Cairo to these regions, and published, in 1766, in the "Philosophical Transactions," "an account of his journey from Cairo in Egypt to the written mountains in the desert of Sinai." He ascribes these writings to *Greek* pilgrims from Constantinople or the Morea, because there happen to be among them one or two brief Greek inscriptions, as if the fact of these one or two being so distinctly Greek did not prove that they have an entirely different authorship and date from the others.

In 1761, Niebuhr was sent out by the King of Denmark to explore Egypt and Arabia. He examined the inscriptions, and thinks them "of little importance," "executed at idle hours by *travellers;*" * as if travellers could climb twenty, fifty, or even 100 feet of sheer precipice, and cover miles with their writing,—one letter of which would take at least a day to engrave! Niebuhr, however, states one very important fact, "*that even in the third century these inscriptions had been mentioned by a Greek author.*" † We regret that he does not give the name of the Greek author, nor his authority, for the statement. He seems, however, to have had no doubt of it. And if this be the case, then the theories about pilgrims, travellers, Greeks from Constantinople, cannot be listened to; and even the more elaborate theory of Beer, which fixes them to the fourth century, is swept away. He then adds, "They were judged to be neither Jewish nor Arabic from the appearance of some coarse pieces of sculpture that accompanied them. At last, a person who was very well versed in Oriental literature, conjectured that they might be Phœnician, an opinion which is the more probable, as the Phœnicians had, at a very remote period, settlements upon the eastern coast of the Arabic Gulf."

In the year 1773, Count Gebelin published his "Le Monde Primitif," in which he endeavours to decipher these writings. With what success we know not, as we have not seen his work.

In 1783, Volney published his travels. He had visited the Written Valley, but only to sneer at what he saw, and at the attempts of others to unfold the secret. "To these (Greek) pilgrims," he says, "we must attribute the inscriptions and clumsy figures of asses, camels, &c., engraven on these rocks, which have, from these, acquired the name of Djebel Mokatteb, or Written Mountain. Mr. W. Montague,

* "Travels," vol. i., p. 202.
† Vol. i., p. 200.

Digitized by Google

who travelled a great deal in these countries, and carefully examined these inscriptions, is of this opinion. M. Count de Gebelin, author of 'Le Monde Primitif,' has lost his labour in endeavouring to discover some mysterious meaning."*

After this, travels to these regions became more frequent; and as each traveller refers to these inscriptions, without casting more light upon their meaning, we need not name them. One important step, however, began to be taken, and that was the copying of them. Messrs. Coutelle and Roziere copied seventy-five; Seetzen, Burckhardt, and Henniker described and copied many; Laborde has given a striking sketch of the whole valley. But the most important work is that of Mr. Gray, who, in the "Transactions of the Royal Society," published 187 inscriptions which he had copied.

So much for the history of these inscriptions. Let us now inquire into their origin.

In general the authorship and interpretation of these has been merely the subject of conjecture. Most travellers have contented themselves with *conjecturing* that they must have been the production of pilgrims on their way to or from Mount Sinai. In reference to this we remark,—

I. There is no other instance throughout the whole world of pilgrims doing the like, *i. e.*, of covering miles of rocks, and cliffs, and mountains, with their writings.

II. These pilgrims being men of various countries, would employ various languages and characters; whereas, these inscriptions are all *of one character*, and must have been engraved by one people. The few Greek inscriptions (if, indeed, there be more than *one*,) are so manifestly of a later date, that they form no exception, but rather confirm our statement.

III. These supposed pilgrims being, of course, Christian, and living some time between the fourth and sixth century, must have employed some one of the then known languages; whereas the characters belong to a wholly extinct language, whatever that may be. Is it within the limits of possibility that pilgrims of the fifth century could cover miles of rock with inscriptions in a language unknown to the Egyptian Cosmas, who tried to read them in the sixth, but could not, and in a language which, *since that age*, has become extinct. What language has become so extinct since the sixth century that its very characters are unknown?

* "Travels," vol. ii. pp. 351, 2.

Digitized by Google

IV. The numbers of pilgrims resorting to holy places before the sixth century are nothing when compared with the myriads that crowded to these in after ages. Is it not, then, *incredible* that the former should have left behind them such marvellous traces of their visits, while the latter should have left literally nothing! A few hundreds traverse the Sinaitic desert and cover it with their inscriptions; myriads pass through the same desert afterwards and leave no memorial!

V. The fact of there being pilgrims in the early centuries in any numbers is a mere matter of conjecture. There is no historical evidence to prove it. In truth, it is a conjecture *got up* for the occasion—a hypothesis on which to build another hypothesis. Take Professor Beer's own statement on this point, and it will shew us the amount of proof:—

"About this period, the custom among Christians of making pilgrimages to the sacred localities, principally to Jerusalem, in expectation of seeing miracles, and from religious motives, was greatly on the increase; insomuch that, towards the end of this century, Gregory, Bishop of Nyssen, judged it necessary to write against the practice in a separate treatise. That Mount Sinai should have been visited at that period by the inhabitants of Palestine or Syria, is, indeed, scarcely credible. Certainly we have no proof whatever of their doing so; though we do not deny that Helena, the mother of Constantine, journeyed to that mountain, and there erected a sanctuary, as the traditions of the monastery of the Transfiguration allege. But it may very well have chanced that this appetite for visiting the sacred localities may have kindled, in some tribes of Arabia Petræa, a like desire of frequenting, from pious motives, for a time, Mount Sinai, and the vallies which witnessed the great miracles of Moses."

VI. It is admitted, as beyond dispute, that these inscriptions must have been executed *at one time, and within one generation.* Beer concedes this. Now is it not something even beyond the marvellous, that one generation of pilgrims should have achieved such prodigious works, whilst no pilgrims, after these thirty or forty years, should have thought of doing the like, even with these notable writings of their predecessors before their eyes? That one generation must have been a peculiar one, the like of which never had been before, and certainly never has been since. That such a generation of pilgrims should be unheard of either in history or tradition is strange indeed.

VII. These inscriptions could only be the work of a great *multitude.* And as this multitude must have gathered to that valley, from whatever countries, *very nearly at the same time,* it seems remarkable that this emigration, or crusade, or whatever it may be called, is not only unknown now, but

Digitized by Google

was unheard of by Cosmas, who visited the locality in the sixth century. This vast multitude must either have come from one nation or from many. If from *one*, how has this *national pilgrimage*, for it must have been by tens of thousands, been obliterated from the annals of these ages? If from *many*, two rather different questions raise themselves,—(1st), How came it to pass that so many nations agreed, all at once, to flock to Sinai? (2d), How did all these many nations agree to record the memorials of their visit in one language and character!

VIII. These writings could only be executed by a people *residing in the desert.* Now, when was the Arabian desert ever the settled residence of any nation? The Bedouin scours it, or pitches his tent in it; but he cannot dwell in it in the proper sense of the word. No multitude could dwell in it without a miracle. No multitude could obtain food, far less water, without a miracle. Thus Jeremiah paints it, "A land of deserts and of pits; a land of drought and of the shadow of death; a land that no man passed through, and *where no man dwelt.*"

IX. These writings could only have been done by a people possessing implements of various kinds, implements which no pilgrims ever think of carrying with them. They must have graving tools of great strength, and in considerable numbers; for in the title of one of the inscriptions the letters are six feet long, and the remaining forty lines in proportion. Besides graving tools, they must have been amply provided with ropes and ladders, for very many of the inscriptions could only have been cut by means of these appliances.

X. The difficulty of working on the face of rocks under a scorching sun is so great that it could only be overcome by men who, living in the desert, could avail themselves of all opportunities, and take things leisurely, or else who were shadowed from the heat in some miraculous way. The labour of *copying* even a few of them is described by travellers as almost insupportable. What must have been the toil of executing them, when we consider, not only their amazing number, but that many of them are cut out in the hard *granite?*

Thus much for the general theory thrown out by most who have visited these localities. To believe that these inscriptions were the work of pilgrims visiting Mount Sinai requires much about the same amount of credulity as to believe that they were graven on the rocks when first created.

Digitized by Google

Indeed we should be inclined to think the latter hypothesis considerably less repugnant to reason, to facts, and to history.

In the year 1840, Professor Beer, of Leipsic, published "A Century of Sinaitic Inscriptions," with an introduction, alphabet, and translations. He sets out with boldly discrediting Cosmas's statement as to the Jewish tradition formerly noticed. As if it were superstition and weakness to ascribe such vestiges to extreme antiquity, he at once pronounces them comparatively modern; and, as if it were credulity and fanaticism to connect them with Scripture history, he sets aside the idea that their authors were the desert-wandering Israelites. One is amazed at the peculiar state of mind which Germany has so often exhibited in her scholars. We see, in many cases, a sad display of hatred to every thing involving miracle, or the interference of Jehovah. And so here we see the same dislike to admit the idea that these inscriptions could be the work of that nation when sojourning in that wilderness under the special guardianship of God.

Let us look at his theory.

I. The region from which the authors of these inscriptions came was Arabia-Petræa, the district of which Petra was the capital. The amount of proof which the Professor has for this opinion is contained in a single sentence,—"I can *have no doubt* that Arabia-Petræa was the region, *since I see no other which can be put in competition with it.*" One does not know whether more to wonder at the confidence at which the Professor had arrived, or at the ground on which that confidence is based.

II. The people who executed these writings were the Nabathæans, inhabiting Arabia-Petræa, immediately preceding the fourth century, "wealthy, *and skilled in the arts*, and flourishing in commerce." Yet these inscriptions, described by Beer himself as "skilled in the arts," are, as he concedes, "executed in the rudest style." * Besides this

* Forster, page 10. As if one contradiction were not enough, the Professor undertakes another. After confessing that he had "no means of demonstrating that the authors (of these inscriptions) sprung from those tribes which formerly constituted the kingdom of the Nabathæans," he adds this statement, "But that the writing can have been the writing of any but the Nabathæans, I greatly doubt; for the free drawing and bold conjunction of the letters are such as I find upon the sculptured rocks of no people of that or of an earlier age, evincing the people to whom these inscriptions owe their origin to have written much and calligraphically, and therefore to have been highly cultivated and flourishing as a common-

Digitized by Google

contradiction, there are other things under this head that raise some questions. (1.) How did these Nabathæans resort to the Sinaitic rocks, and overlook their own, when so disposed to engrave? (2.) How did they come to an agreement to do all this in *one generation;* and what had former generations been about that they never thought of doing it? (3.) How came it to pass that it was in the latter and most civilized age of their history that they executed these "rude" sculptures, and not in their early age, when they might be supposed to be rude in writing as well as in manners? (4.) How is it that these inscriptions, if executed by Nabathæans in the fourth century, should be utterly unreadable in the sixth, even by their nearest neighbours, the Egyptians and Jews? *

To all this we add the following sentence from Mr. Forster:—

"In his theory of the Nabathæan origin of the Sinaitic inscriptions, this author has most unaccountably closed his eyes to the noted fact—a fact fully brought out in his own statements, that the great mass of these inscriptions occurs, not on any of the routes from Arabia Petrea to Mount Sinai, but on the direct road from Mount Sinai to Suez and Egypt, and pre-eminently in the Wady and Djebel Mokatteb, on the coast road to Suez. The single known exception to this remark, the road from Djebel Mousa or Mount Hor to Akaba through the Wady Arabah, which has been described but very recently, is in the ascertained line of march of the Israelites, it being the only route open to them from Mount Hor to Akaba or Ezion-Geber."

III. The character in which these writings are executed is the one that was formerly in use in Western Arabia-Petræa, but has become extinct. Now this is pure and unmingled conjecture. Beer had not seen this Nabathæan language of which he speaks, and thus far his conjecture is one simply founded on the ignorance both of himself and others. But it so happens that a genuine Nabathæan inscription has been found at Petra, by Messrs. Irby and Mangles, carved

wealth."* He had told us that the inscriptions were executed "in the rudest style;" but now he tells us that their authors must have been a people "who wrote much, and calligraphically," &c. What could Beer really mean by all this? Or how could he expect his theory to gain credit among thinking men, when it involves such palpable self-contradictions?

* "There is no credulity like the credulity of scepticism, whether theological or philological. Professor Beer determines the Sinaitic inscriptions to be Nabathæan, and their date the middle of the fourth century. Now as, in the age of Cosmas, all knowledge and tradition of their characters and contents appear to have been lost among the Arabs of the district, by whom he was sure to be attended, it results that the Nabathæan language and letters (being those of the most polished and powerful people of Arabia), must have flourished, and become unknown, between A. D. 350 and A. D. 520."

Digitized by Google

deep on a rock in five lines. In this inscription, the characters (as might be expected in the case of all eastern dialects), do bear in one or two respects a resemblance to some in the Sinaitic inscription, but at the same time preserve a marked difference; sufficient to disprove the idea that the Nabathæans were the engravers of the Sinaitic rocks.

IV. These engravings were executed in the fourth century. The chief evidence for this is contained in the following sentence:—"Cosmas appears to have conveyed the first tidings of the existence of these inscriptions to the learned of his age; whence we conjecture the date of the inscriptions to be very little prior to the age of Cosmas himself."* Passing over the inconclusiveness of the above statement, we proceed to remark, that as the Nabathæan nation *was in existence during the time that Cosmas visited the written valley, nay considerably later*, it seems incredible that their language should not be understood by any. Was there no stray Nabathæan Arab to be found (he could not be above 150 miles off at the most) to interpret the writing? Is it credible that the Nabathæan language should be utterly unknown within the very district where it had not only been spoken for ages before Christ, but where it was actually spoken at the moment when Cosmas traversed that region. The Roman Conquest, so far from extinguishing the nation, gave a fresh impulse to its trade. In the fourth century it became the diocese of a Metropolitan Bishop, whose title was Petra; and it was not till the seventh century that its commercial property entirely disappeared. Now, even granting that the Roman dominion did alter their language—granting that the wild Arabs, who swept over it when the Roman power grew weak, did effect some change in the dialect, is it possible that these changes could so have obliterated the ancient language and alphabet, that these were unknown in the adjoining region in the beginning of the sixth century? Besides all this, the statement of Niebuhr, viz., *that these inscriptions had been mentioned by a Greek author in the third century*, is fatal to Beer's theory.

V. These inscriptions were the work of Christian pilgrims from Nabathæan Arabia. This part of his theory is, like the others, mere conjecture. Beyond the general fact, that about the fourth century pilgrimages became common, he has absolutely nothing to rest on. He cannot show us that the Nabathæans ever became pilgrims, far less that tens of thousands of them did so. And even though he could, yet

* Forster, p. 15.

Digitized by Google

unless he could prove *that no other nation sent its pilgrims to Sinai*, how is it possible to account for the fact that all the inscriptions are in one character, and of one generation? Was there some peculiar *cacoethes scribendi* that made these Nabathæans come loaded with implements to cover hill and valley with their carvings?—and was there some peculiar horror of writing that prevented the pilgrims of every other nation from leaving a vestige of their visit on the roads of Sinai?

VI. These inscriptions must have been Christian, because some are marked with a cross. Here we admit that there is something which looks like argument, and were this established, the Professor might crave a hearing. But, then, let us consider, first, that these supposed crosses are very few in number; secondly, that they look very unlike what we call crosses, being liker the sign of *plus* in algebra; thirdly, that these supposed crosses are letters of Oriental alphabets. The Phœnician for instance; the Hebrew, as seen in coins, form their *Tau* precisely of the shape of these inscriptions. Both the Ethiopic and the Coptic have similar letters. But here we may quote Mr. Forster:—

"The single ground upon which the Professor's theory rests is, as already stated, the occasional occurrence of a character †, which he assumes to be the sign of 'the Christian Cross.' The occurrence of this sign, however, being too infrequent alone to sustain his hypothesis, this ingenious writer proceeds to strengthen it by the discovery, in another character, Y, of a second form of the cross. With singular simplicity he confesses, at the same time, that for this form he can produce no precedent, that it is unexampled and unknown in church history. Undaunted, however, by this consideration, he believes it to be the cross, because, in some parts, the malefactor's cross *may* have been so constructed, or furcated instead of transverse; and because, prior to the age of Constantine, when the transverse form † (as he freely admits), was the only form of the Christian cross, as emblazoned on the ensigns, and shields, and coins of the empire, the furcated form Y *may* have existed somewhere, and among some Christian people, as a sign of the cross.

"Now, as the absurdity of learned hallucinations such as these has not prevented their finding learned admirers, it becomes necessary for the truth-sake to bring this argument from the sign of the cross to an issue. It is clear that none who subscribe this discovery of the sign of the cross in the Sinaitic inscriptions, and who thence infer with Beer the Christianity of their authors, can, consistently at least, object to the extension of the argument. If the occurrence of the character be a ground of argument at all, it ought to be so everywhere.

"To begin with the oldest country, and the earliest records of mankind, Egypt, heathen Egypt, discloses Professor Beer's sign of 'the Christian cross' upon her monuments, from the sands of Rosetta to the upper cataracts of the Nile. The character †, for example, which, on its single occurrence at Sinai, appears to the heated imagination of this writer, at

Digitized by Google

once the sign of the Christian cross, and the monogram of the sacred names Christ Jesus, is, by the plain English common sense of Mr. Gray, pronounced 'an Egyptian hieroglyphic;'* and is neither more nor less than that most frequent character of the hieroglyphics, so well known by the names of the 'Crux Ansata,' and of 'the Sacred Tau.'

"From Egypt to whatever quarter of the globe we turn, to the old world or to the new, to Assyria, to Bactria, to Etruria, to Central America, this sign of the cross reappears on the monuments and in the inscriptions of every Heathen land. And while Professor Beer adduces, from Sinai, the forms † or Y, as indubitable forms of 'the Christian Cross,' and irrefragable proofs of the Christianity of the authors of the Sinaitic inscriptions, I can produce, from heathen Bactria, the figure of an Indo-Macedonian king, Azes, B.C. 140, mounted upon the double-humped Bactrian camel, and bearing in his right hand a cross, which might have graced the hand of a standard-bearer of Constantine, or of a warrior Bishop of the Crusades. The key to the whole mystery is shortly and simply this: the character misnamed the cross, is the letter *t*; the Sinai *t*, the Egyptian *t*, the old Hebrew *t*, the Assyrian *t*, the Bactrian *t*, the Etruscan *t*, the Ethiopic *t*, or (to come nearer home) the plain, honest English *t*, the oldest at once, and latest, form of the letter, in the most widely parted alphabets of the world."

With this quotation we dismiss Professor Beer and his Nabathæan theory,—one of the most preposterous, reckless, fanciful, desperate, that was ever invented to prevent a Rationalist's believing anything that looked like a confirmation of Scripture truth and miracle.

Having set it aside, where is there another? Or what theory can be imagined by the utmost fertility of man's imagination that can account for the various things which we have noted in these wonderful inscriptions? Is there any people in whom all the discordances seem to unite and be harmonized, save Israel in their desert sojourn? Suppose these writings to have been their work, then *everything is accounted for* in the simplest and most natural way. Deny that they are Israel's, and you may ascribe them to chance, or the giants, or the angels, or any other race of beings you please,—but no earthly nation, which history has written of, could have executed these sculptures.†

Mr. Forster thinks he has discovered the key to the language, and its interpretation. And we have no doubt that,

* "It is to be observed that there is an Egyptian hieroglyphic of precisely this form."—*Gray*, ii.

† The *figures* sketched, are strong confirmations. We have in some a peculiar rock, rudely carved,—evidently, the rock that was smitten. In others we have a man holding up both hands in the attitude of prayer, evidently Moses praying on the hill when Joshua was fighting with Amalek. In another we have a serpent springing upon a man, evidently a sketch of one of the fiery serpents. And it is remarkable that the inscription under, or above, or around each of these, as decyphered by Mr. Forster, exactly corresponds with the figure.

Digitized by Google

in part, he has, though his discoveries are still imperfect. It is impossible for us to convey to our readers a right idea of Mr. Forster's system, unless we could transfer his well-executed plates to our pages. To a certain extent, then, we can do nothing but refer those interested in this profoundly interesting subject, to Mr. F.'s book. It is not all that we could have wished in point of arrangement, but still it contains the needful information; and this the reader can make use of for himself. *

The language is not Hebrew, neither is it Egyptian, properly speaking. And herein consists one of the corroborations of Mr. Forster's theory. For, if he be correct, then these writings are *in the ancient* Egyptian character,—just that which we might have expected Israel to have used. Thus Mr. F. explains himself:—

"The opinion of Cosmas, then, so long, and so unjustly contemned, is, after all, the right and true judgment: namely, that the Sinaitic inscriptions were the work of the ancient Israelites, during their forty years' wanderings in the wilderness. But from the settlement of their authorship there arises a further question, as to the language, or dialect, in which they were written. The word **I S I**, *Iao*, answering to the Greek Ιαω, in three letters, for the ineffable Name, instead of the Scriptural word יהוה, *Jehovah*, in four, alone sufficiently indicates that language, or dialect, not to have been the Hebrew of the Old Testament. Hebrew words and phrases, indeed, in common with all the Semitic dialects, it has been shown, and will hereafter more fully be proved, to contain, but its vocabulary is not the Mosaic Hebrew. But if it be not Hebrew, the reason of the case tells us that it must have been the ancient Egyptian: the vernacular idiom of the country and people, among whom the Israelites had sojourned for the term of eight generations, or of two hundred and fifteen years. To this conclusion, I have already shown, we are independently conducted, by the identity of the Sinaitic alphabet with those of Masara and Rosetta. But the ancient Egyptian, like the ancient Hamyaritic, it will appear hereafter, was one of those primitive dialects of mankind, which, by a severe simplicity, by the nearly total absence of prepositions, conjunctions, inflexions, declensions, moods, tenses, voices, prefixes, affixes, and suffixes, and what may not unappropriately be termed the accidents of speech, prove their near relationship to a common origin, the 'one language, and one speech,' which obtained before the confusion of tongues at Babel. Its near relation to the Hamyaritic is most apparent, in the number of purely Hamyaritic characters to be found, both upon the monuments of Egypt, and upon the rocks of Sinai. But the Hamyaritic itself is chiefly that portion of the Arabic, of which Arabic scholars, from

* We are doubtful about the author's interpretation of the Greek inscription. The word which he gives as Thibet or Thibed, is certainly Thibo, if it is anything. It is not the Greek delta, but a rude form of *o*. It is, however, very curious to find the name of Kosmas on the rocks in Greek letters; nay, twice over, for the last line, as given by Pococke, seems to contain it, or part of it, again. Only let us remember there were three or four of that name. This, however, is of no consequence.

Digitized by Google

Pococke downwards, have so often observed, that, while it occupies more than one half of all the Arabic lexicons, it rarely, if ever, is to be met with in any Arabic writers. This was the statement of the case made to the present writer, at Paris, in 1844, by one of the first Arabic scholars in Europe, who had been studying Arabic for thirty years without being able to account for the anomaly; but observed, 'The problem is now solved, this is the lost Hamyaritic.'

"In the decypherment, therefore, of all primitive tongues, the Arabic lexicon, more than one half of which has been heretofore a dead letter, is the proper standard of appeal. And since the appeal, as will be hereafter experimentally shown, is attended with equal success in them all, it further follows, that all the primitive tongues are most nearly allied among themselves; while their severe simplicity of structure indicates divergement in the slightest possible degree from their common source, the one primeval language."

Let us now briefly sketch some of the decypherments. The first is the passage of the Red Sea. In Exod. xv. 17, we read, "The *horse* of Pharaoh went in," &c. Now there is an inscription and a hieroglyphic on one of the rocks in connexion with this, strikingly bringing out the exactness and literality of the above passage in the Song of Moses.

"In the fourth line of this inscription, the eye was arrested by a hieroglyphical character in the form of a horse. The Arabic و, *fa*, which formed the head and neck of the animal, being followed by ρ, the Greek *rho*, and by the Hebrew ע, *âin*, the royal name of *Pharaoh* apparently stood before me. To ascertain whether the contents of the inscription tallied with the name was the next and instant object. The decyphered inscription proved to be a record of the passage of the Red Sea, and of the vain attempt of Pharaoh to escape from the returning waters by flight on horseback.

"The characters of this inscription were all sufficiently clear, and being mostly letters of known forms, on the principle of assigning to them their known powers, it was decypherable with comparative facility. The last word alone presented an impediment; for it was a monogram, and with the disentangling of monograms I was not, at this period, familiar. The sense required by the whole context was *horse*, or *war-horse*. But some time elapsed before I discovered that the last word was ربط, *rabat;* and that the Arabic word رباط, signifies 'A horse of ancient race,' or, 'Horses prepared for war.'

"Previously to the completion of the decypherment, the action of the hieroglyphic horse had perplexed me. As he seemed neither to advance nor recede, I had set down the neck thrown backwards, and the disparted fore-legs, as symbolical, perhaps, of the haughty bearing of his rider. The full decypherment first undeceived me. The king is in the act of retreat; his horse has just received the check of the rein, by which the head is thrown back, and the fore-legs are parted, while the hind-legs remain as yet unmoved. The whole action is one familiar to every horseman, who has suddenly and violently checked his horse."

There seem to be two inscriptions referring to this, one of which Mr. F. thus translates:—"*Fleeth the swift long horse,*

Digitized by Google

raising both forefeet together, going at full speed, his rider dashed to the ground; Pharaoh running with long strides like a fleet-horse takes startled flight, casting off violently with both hands, to quicken his pace, his helmet." The other he gives thus:—"*The people journeyeth through the passage terror-stricken: urges onward with slackened rein benignantly, Jehovah, the people. The people essayeth the waters; Pharaoh retrograding, reins back his war-horse.*"

In connexion with this we may notice the magnificent inscription of about 100 feet in height. The *title* is all that has yet been copied by travellers. It (the title) alone is six feet in height, though consisting of but one line. It has forty-one successive lines under this, evidently forming one entire piece, which Mr. F. conjectures is the Song of Moses! We trust that no time will be lost in having it copied and sent home. It will form the best test of the truth of Mr. F.'s theory.

The next inscriptions decyphered by Mr. F. are those relating to the feathered fowls. Of these there are three, very similar to each other. We give only the first. "*The red geese ascend from the sea; lusting, the people eat on at them.*"

The next two refer to the rock in Horeb. There, in the heart of these, the rude sketch of a rock, and the decypherment of the words is as follows:—"*The people the hard stone satiates with water, thirsting.*" Again:—"*The hard rock water a great miracle.*" *

The next is the battle of Rephidim. Here there is the figure of a man with uplifted hands. The decypherment runs thus:—"*Prayeth unto God the prophet upon a hard great stone; his hands sustaining Aaron Hur.*"

The next we come to, is the plague of the fiery serpents. In this inscription there is the figure of a serpent in the act of striking a prostrate Israelite. The serpent is represented as curling in sinuous folds. The interpretation is as follows:—"*Destroy, springing on the people, the fiery serpents. Hissing, injecting venom, heralds of death—they kill. The people prostrating on their back, curling in folds, they wind round, descending on, bearing destruction.*"

These specimens must suffice. There are many others in this volume; and there are thousands of others in the desert of Sinai yet uncopied and undeciphered. No time, we trust, will be lost in bringing home more. The field of antiquities

* There are several others connected with the miracle of the rock, which we are obliged to pass over for want of room.

Digitized by Google

thus opened up, promises to be one of profoundest interest—far beyond that attaching either to Nineveh or Babylon.

If these inscriptions are Israel's own records of the Lord's dealings with them, how much light may yet be cast on Scripture! The rocks of Sinai may yet prove reflectors of a wondrous light upon many things that have hitherto been accounted dark and puzzling.

If these inscriptions are, indeed; Israel's own records of the Lord's dealings with them, then what can the infidel say? Is not his mouth stopped? The very stones cry out against him, and say, "the God of Israel is He who alone doth wonders, his name is Jehovah."

If these inscriptions be truly Israelitish, how completely is the whole theory of *myths* swept away. Strauss may turn each chapter of the Bible into a *myth*, but what will he do with these rock-written records? They are not taken from Scripture; nay, they must have been written prior to most of the Pentateuch, yet they narrate simple facts, in which mythism can have no place for developing itself, or displaying its dextrous feats of jugglery and lies.

And who can say but that God is preparing lessons for Israel, when He brings them the second time into the wilderness, and pleads with them as He pleaded with their fathers? How unutterably solemn would it be for that long-rebellious and unbelieving people to be led to Sinai and Horeb again; and as they passed through that hideous desart, to find each rock blazing with unexpected light; teeming with the records of Jehovah's wonders, both of love and power, and shedding down on the sacred volume (so long an unfelt and unrealized word, though always in their hands), a radiance so bright, yet so venerable in its brightness, as utterly to prostrate and overwhelm the pride of their unbroken hearts.

Art. II.—GENESIS.

Ver. 1.—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

Heaven and earth are the two places or regions, whose history, God, in his Word, purposes to write.* He who

* "To the idea of a creation out of nothing, no ancient cosmogony has ever risen. . . . The peculiarity belonging to the Bible cosmogony (having as its fundamental idea a creation out of nothing), places it at once in an entirely different category from all ancient myths. . . . It

Digitized by Google

alone knows everything relating to them, secret or open, undertakes to put on record for us, at "sundry times, and in diverse manners," some memorials of the strange wonders, which, in word and deed, have taken place within their bounds. It is to "heaven and earth" that He confines his information, and of all beyond these he says but little. Of what they have been, and of what they yet shall be, when his great original purpose shall unfold itself in all its parts, in the ages to come, He gives us his own account. The Bible is God's history of heaven and earth, the only authentic history of them in existence. He begins and ends his volume with these; and throughout it, they form the scene of his manifold plans and workings, the circle over which his divine love spreads itself in its glorious manifestations of wisdom and of power.

He sets out with asserting his own prerogative as Creator—the originating One, the unbeginning One. His opening statement tells us that the things which we see are not self-produced. They are not from eternity. They once were not. They once *began* to be.* And it was He whose name is God (Elohim), that caused them to begin. He created them all, upper and lower, far off and near. Thus He gives the lie to the pretensions of every idol, and sets aside the gods of the Heathen, as non-creators. (Ps. xcvi. 5; Jer. x. 11.)

He gives us no date for his creation. He does not tell us *when* the heavens and earth began to be. He tells us that they had a beginning; but when that beginning was, He does not say. It might be six thousand, or it might be sixty thousand years ago. The object of the statement is simply

is only by the most violent exegetical methods that this idea can be banished from Gen. i. 1."—"Havernick's Introduction to the Pentateuch," p. 94; see also Dr. Buckland's note in his "Bridgewater Treatise," vol. i., p. 22.

* ראשׁית. The "beginning" (Gen. x. 10), "former times," indefinitely. (Isa. xlvi. 10.) *αρχη*, the corresponding word in Greek, applied to Christ in reference to the *eternal* past. (John i. 1.) In Prov. viii. 22, we read, "The Lord possessed me in the *beginning* of his way, before his works of old." Hence He has the name of *τον απ' αρχης*, "him from the beginning" (1 John ii. 13); and also *ἡ ἀρχὴ της κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*, the beginning or head of the creation of God; nay, He is called simply *αρχη*, the beginning, or head, or fountain. (Col. i. 18.) Farther He is called *ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος*, "the beginning and the end." (Rev. i. 8, 21; xxi. 6; xxii. 13.) And we may notice that the words in which He is designated (Heb. xii. 2) author (or leader), and finisher (bringing-up of the rear), are words derived from the above of the Apocalypse,—*αρχηγος καὶ τελειωτης*. See Fleming's "Christology," vol. i., p. 276; Hitchcock's "Religion of Geology," sec. 2.

Digitized by Google

to claim creation as his own exclusive handiwork; and to declare that when it began to be, it began to be by his creating power.*

Strange that any other thought should have entered the mind of man! Self-creation, chance-creation, how monstrous! A palace built by itself; a city reared by chance; life without a living One! How incredible! The world declares its Creator. It has a voice which says, "I did not create myself; He who created me is one infinitely more glorious than myself." (Rom. i. 20.) Even reason sees this; yet it is faith that discerns it fully, and sees *who* it is that made all things. (Heb. xi. 2.) The God of the Bible is just such an One as we could suppose to be the Creator of the world. The gods of the Heathen (taking their own best descriptions of them), could not have done it. Look at the Bible, and read what it makes known of God, and you will say, "this is just such a God as could have planned and made the world." Look up at the heavens, and see how they declare the glory of God, and you will say, "the God that made these heavens is just such a God as could have written this Book."

He who made all things to be, must be the I AM, the Being of beings, the fountain-head of being. And who but He could give us the history of creation? Who but the beginning and the end could speak from his own knowledge, and say thus, with authoritative certainty: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Reason may speak of a God, for the visible creation does declare an invisible Creator (Rom. i. 20); but when asked, "What is his name, and what is his Son's name, if thou canst tell"† (Prov. xxx. 4), it is speechless. God himself must be the revealer of the

* There can be no doubt that "heaven" here means the visible firmament above us, in which the stars and planets seem to be set. (See vers. 8, 14, 15, 17.) The word occurs upwards of 400 times in the Old Testament, and though in some of these it does mean that heaven, which is the dwelling-place of God, and is called the "heaven of heavens," and the "third heaven," yet in by far the most instances it means as I have said. Its root is a word signifying "to be high."

† It would occupy more room than we can now spare to inquire into the meaning of the Hebrew names for God. (See Hengstenberg on the Pentateuch, vol. i. 213, &c.; Fry on Job, part i., sec. 1.) Nor shall we take up the subject of the Son being the Creator. Most distinctly is this asserted, John i. 3; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2. In that curious and able book, "Fleming's Christology," the reader will find much upon this subject. (See also "Owen's Christologia," ch. iv.) The Three Persons of the Trinity were all concerned in the old creation just as they are in the new. Creation was *from* the Father, *through* the Son, *by* the Holy Spirit.

Digitized by Google

mighty secret. And He has revealed it; He has told his nam and his Son's name. Man cannot give a name to God; God has himself done it, and that name is our refuge and our joy.

Oh, the folly of *atheism!* A world without a maker! Oh, the misery of atheism! No glorious One, no perfect One, no blessed One—how sad! What a blank there would be if this were true. It would be a sky without a star, a world without a sun. And what feebleness in *reason!* It cannot even name the name of God; and when it tries, as Heathenism has done, to repeat the name first given, it does so with a stammering tongue. What could reason tell us of Jehovah? What can it say without a Bible? Man without a Bible—what can he say? No Bible: what a blank! No message of love, no teachings of holy wisdom from Him who made us! Impossible! To believe that it could be so would be to be more credulous than the Pagan savage.

VER. 2.—"And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep."

Such was the state of this earth about the period when this history begins. It was a region of rayless darkness. Deepest night rested over it. It was without form, utterly shapeless in all its parts. It was *void*, that is, *unfilled up*.* None of these things existed which make up its "fulness." (Ps. xxiv. 1.) In none of its parts was there any filling up. It was like the newly quarried block ere the sculptor's chisel has touched it. Evidently pointing back to this chaos, and using it as a figure, Job describes the grave as "a land of darkness, and the shadow of death; a land of darkness; as darkness itself; of the shadow of death; without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Jeremiah also describes the land of

We may notice here the expression in Rev. iv. 11, rendered in our translation, "for thy pleasure they are and were created." It is, *διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου*; the *will* of God in creation is that which is pointed out.

* תֹהוּ, An old German commentator (1614), thus brings out the meaning; "Proprie Hebraea vocabula significant vanitatem et inanitatem terrae quae destituta adhuc omni cultura, vestitu, ornatu ac varietate montium aut vallium." Rungius in Genesin, p. 11. See Deut. xxxii. 10: "the *waste* howling wilderness." Ps. cvii. 40: "causeth them to wander in the *wilderness*." Is. xxiv. 10: "the city of *confusion* is broken up." Ch. xxxiv. 11: "the line of *confusion*." Jer. iv. 23: "it was *without form* and void." The Sept. have translated the word variously, as if at a loss, and this lost passage in the common readings runs, "I beheld the earth, and there was nothing." *ἴδου ὀυθεν*; but the other fragmentary versions give *κενη και ουθεν*, or *κενωμα και ὀυθεν*. (See "Spohn's Commentary on the Greek Versions of Jeremiah," pp. 68, 69.) The word בֹּהוּ only occurs twice elsewhere (Isa. xxxiv. 11, Jer. iv. 23) and signifies emptiness.

Digitized by Google

Israel, in the day of calamity, in language of the same kind (Jerem. iv. 23), and Nahum predicts the ruin of Nineveh in words taken from this description of the original chaos. (Ch. ii. 10.) Then farther it is called "deep," or *abyss;* as if it presented one great mass of confused and turbid water.*

How long this state of chaos might have existed, we know not. Not a word is said to intimate the time. It is not such a condition of things as might have been expected to come directly from the hand of God; for all that comes from Him is *perfect,* in its kind and in its degree. The infant is perfect in all its parts, though it is not a man; the seed is perfect, though it is not a flower or a tree. So that this chaos looks like the wreck of a former world—the ruins of some vast city or temple; it seems to be the result of the destruction of a previous state of things. It is not the infancy of a new creation that we behold, but the mangled and corrupting corpse of the old, which must be buried out of sight ere the new can be begun.

Ver. 2.—"And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

How long or how brief the period of chaos was it matters not. The appointed time was now come when these ruins were to undergo a change, and under the hand of the great Master Builder to rise into another temple. God's Spirit went forth to renew the face of creation.† Like a bird

* This deep or abyss held in solution and suspension, the material elements of which the crust is composed. It is "the abyss of chaotic elements, out of which the world was formed."—Moses Stuart's "Chrestomathy," p. 112. He gives as the root, הוּם, to be confused or bewildered. Robertson gives as the root, חָמַם, intensius ferbuit aestus, or הוּם, tumultuatus est. Clavis, p. 4: one of the fathers thus describes it: "hanc (Terram) enim infernae vastitudinis demersa et immersa abyssus sustentat;" then, after quoting two passages as to the earth being founded on the seas, he adds: "hanc immensam atque infinitam vastitatem, abyssum Scriptura solita est. nuncupare."—Hilary on the second Psalm. Works, p. 198.

† It is not surprising to find Dathe translating this, *ventus a Deo immissus,* or Rosenmuller and Doederlein referring it to some sort of *ενεργεια,* or *vis divina;* but it is sad to see Moses Stuart adopting the same view, and rendering רוּחַ merely "Divine energy or efficacy." (Hebrew Chrestomathy, p. 112.) The different senses of the word may be thus classified:—1. It means *wind* (Exod. x. 13), which is by a figure the spirit of the earth. 2. The spirit of a man (Prov. xviii. 4.) 3. The spirit of the evil one (Judges ix. 2, 3.) 4. The Spirit of God (Isa. lxi. 1.) In all of these there is *personality* implied, not mere vague influence. As when the spirit of a man is spoken of it is a *personality* that is referred to, not an *influence;* so when the Spirit of God is spoken of it is the same. It is of this personality in God, which comes out everywhere in Scripture, so vividly and so blessedly, that Rationalism robs us; thereby snapping the firmest links that bind us, whose own personality is such a conscious thing, to Him who is infinitely personal, the three-one Jehovah. It is one of

Digitized by Google

brooding over its eggs, and bringing life out of them by its vital heat, the Spirit brooded over the face of the deep or abyss. Immediately the quickening, renewing process began. In what way He wrought upon creation we know not, but his almighty touch produced some change, and vitality was diffused throughout creation. (Job xxvi. 13; Ps. xxxiii. 6, civ. 30.) And when the great restoring process is begun at the Lord's second coming, the Holy Spirit takes the same part in the work of restitution as at first; for it is when He "is poured out from on high," that "the wilderness becomes a fruitful field" (Isa. xxxii. 15.) thus identifying Him as at once the converter of the soul, and the restorer of creation. He is the great agent in every process for restoring or perfecting or beautifying soul and body, nay the very earth itself. He is the author of all the loveliness that we see around us in herb, or shrub, or tree, or flower. All life, all beauty, all order, all perfection are from the Holy Spirit! How near should we feel Him to be, how gracious, how willing to quicken us, and restore to us the lost beauty of our first creation!

Ver. 3.—"And God said, Let there be light, and there was light."

God put this question to Job, "Where is the way where light dwelleth?" (ch. xxxviii. 19*) and this verse is an

the redeeming points in the fathers, that they never fail to bring out these personalities in Scripture. Their passion for the mystical often carries them too far, leading them to maintain personalities where there are none; but this is the lesser evil of the two. Thus Augustine affirms that "the finger of God," so frequently referred to, is the Holy Spirit; and he proves this by our Lord's saying in one place, that He wrought his miracles by the finger of God, and in another by the Spirit. (See his *enaratio* on the 90th (91st) Psalm. The word רָחַף occurs only three times in Scripture—in the passage before us, where it is rendered "moved"—in Deut. xxxii. 11, where it is translated "fluttereth over her young"—and in Jerem. xxiii. 9, where it means tremble. These instances taken in connexion with the meaning of cognate words in Syriac (as Gesenius points out), show that it is to the action of brooding over the young that reference is made. An old writer has this remark: "God the Spirit alone doth hatch the earth out of the waters." In "Suicer's Thesaurus" (vol. ii., p. 765, 766), there are some striking quotations from the Greek fathers to this effect, from which, however, we are disappointed to find that Theodoret and Athanasius understood "the Spirit" to mean *air*, or *wind*.

* In Job xxxvii. 15, we read, "dost thou know when God disposed them, and *caused the light of his cloud to shine?*" As this seems to refer to the time of Creation, are we not to understand that the light then made to shine was kindled by "the cloud," the same cloud which gave light to Israel in the desert, and is, in the latter day, to pour down its glorious brightness on Mount Zion. (Isa. iv. 5.) Is not the Shekinah the abode and fountain-head of light? "who coverest thyself with light as with a garment!" (Ps. civ. 2.)

Digitized by Google

answer to this, as if God had said, "The light dwelleth with me; for I issued the command 'be light,' and 'light was.'" Thus God claims light as his production, as he had already claimed creation. The name of the Maker of light is *Elohim*,—God! "I form the light." (Isa. xlv. 7.) Of all light, both for soul and body, He is the Creator, nay the great central sun and source. "I am the light of the world." (John viii. 12.)*

God does not mean to teach us here that this was the first time that such a thing as light existed at all. There must have been light before, light with God, light with the angels, light in heaven, and, it may be, light shining on this very earth before its state of chaos began. It is a heathen or philosophic fable that darkness was the original and uncreated state of things.† Darkness is always associated with death in Scripture, just as light is with life. Nay, darkness is associated with "him who has the power of death, even the devil;" he is "the ruler of the darkness of this world;" and it is in connexion with the sin and doom both of him and his angels that darkness is spoken of. (2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude, 6.‡).

* "Hail, holy light! Offspring of heaven first-born,
Or of the Eternal co-eternal beam,
May I express thee unblamed? Since God is light,
And never but in unapproached light
Dwelt from eternity, dwelt then in thee
Bright effluence, of bright essence increate.
Or hear'st thou rather, pure ethereal stream,
Whose fountain who can tell? Before the sun,
Before the heavens thou wert, and at the voice
Of God as with a mantle didst invest
The rising world of waters dark and deep,
Won from the vast and formless infinite."
Milton's "Paradise Lost." B. III.

† We may notice that Christ adds here, "he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, *but shall have the light of life*,"—τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς,—"the light of *the life*;" referring to chap. i. 4, "the *life* was the *light* of men," ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. It is as the *living* One that He is the *light-giving* One.

‡ The question may arise here, what was the connexion of Satan with this world before this time? Was it through him and his rebellion that the world was first wrecked and brought to the state of chaos and darkness mentioned in the second verse; was the restoration of light (third verse) an invasion of his domain? Was the fall a *partial* quenching of the light,—*partial*, for grace was to prevent its being total? Has not the state of the world ever since been one of darkness and subjection to the Prince of darkness? Were not the words of Christ (Luke xxii. 53) an intimation of a crisis in the history of this darkness and of its ruler, as if it were for a time to succeed in its long-waged conflict with the light: αὑτη ὑμῶν ἐστιν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσια τοῦ σκότους. The expression, ἐξουσια τοῦ σκότους, is a very remarkable one, and full of solemn meaning. And had not the darkness

Digitized by Google

Whatever may have been the origin of the darkness, we know that it covered the earth, thick and impenetrable in its gloom. But now the command went forth, and the darkness began to disappear. The sun did not at once shew itself, but its light began to find its way dimly and faintly through the gloom, which, from this time, became less and less dense, so that there was now only partial darkness, such as there is in a dull misty morning. How this alteration was produced we know not. We know this, indeed, that a very slight change in the component parts or elements of our atmosphere, or in the proportions in which these elements are combined would completely disorganize it, and prevent its being the medium of light. Its transparency depends on combinations which require to be most nicely proportioned, so that as, on the one hand, an alteration in these could have produced the previous state of total darkness, so another change would, by restoring its lucidity, let in light upon the earth. Accordingly the command went forth which was to restore transparency to our atmosphere, which, at this time, was not only unfit to transmit, but even to bear the dense humid vapours that loaded it. One word from Almighty lips effected the change whatever it might be. He spake, and it was done! A word, no more! How easy with God! And He who lighted up the world, is the same as He that lights up the soul. (2 Cor. iv. 6.) He is the "light of the world," the "morning star," the sun of righteousness. His work in the soul is to fit it for receiving light, and then to pour it in. He restores transparency to the faculties of the soul, and then the light begins to find its way into each region and recess.

"On whom does not His light arise," asks Bildad. (Job xxv. 3.) David says, in reference to the heavenly orbs, "Their line is gone out through all the earth;" (Ps. xix. 4.) and our Lord says, "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good." (Matt. v. 45.) What a declaration of grace does each day's light make to us! What a Gospel does each sunbeam preach! He has not turned our earth into a region of "outer darkness;" and this is grace. He still bids his

on the cross a reference to the past history of the world, as the region of darkness and the kingdom of its prince? And does not the darkening of the sun and moon, just before the coming of the Lord, betoken that darkness had reached its destined crisis, both spiritually and morally, the earth being reduced to the state of chaos described by Moses; and therefore ready once more for the interposing power of Him who said at first, "Let light be."

Digitized by Google

sun go forth each morning to light our ways, sinners as we are; and this tells us of his willingness to give light to the darkest.

"Light is sown for the righteous!" Yes, it is *sown* in the fullest sense of that word; not merely *scattered abroad*, as commentators would have it, but *sown*. And this both naturally and spiritually. (1.) *Naturally*. This is not the time of light. A change has passed upon it by the fall. It has lost much of its purity and brightness. And the mere increase of its *intensity* would not serve unless its innocuous mildness were restored along with it. But there is a time predicted when "the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days." (Isa. xxx. 26.)* Were the sun still to "smite by day, and the moon by night" (Ps. cxxi. 6), this increase of light would be no blessing; but the "restitution of all things" shall embrace in it a restitution of primeval mildness to the light; and who can tell how much of the removal of the curse upon the earth may be effected by this restoration of its genial, health-giving, fructifying properties to the light. But this is only the time of sowing. It doth not yet appear what it shall be. It is underground, or at most it is but in the blade or bud. And oh, if this its imperfect state be so very beautiful, what will not its perfection be in the coming harvest; if the bud be so fair and fragrant, what will be the expanded blossom in the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness? The sowing time is one of tears, the shower and the sunshine mingled together; but the reaping time shall be glorious. (2.) *Spiritually*. This is the hour of the power of darkness. In one sense we have been brought into "marvellous light" (1 Pet. ii.); "Christ has given us light" (Eph. v.) But still we see through "a glass darkly." (1 Cor. xiii.) Clouds fold themselves round us; sorrow and conflict, misgivings and faintings, beset us on each side. But sunshine shall yet burst on us. Light is *sown* for us; the light of an unsetting and an unsmiting sun—the light of Him who is light itself, and in whom is no

* There seems to be in reference to the *light*, just as in regard to all the various parts of creation, a time of *crisis* spoken of in those predictions, which point to the latter day glory, and the previous signs of its arrival. The deterioration which took place at the fall, and which has been going on since, arrives at its *crisis* just at the coming of the Great Restorer. Every thing is to be at its worst just when on the point of being renewed. Hence the darkness which is to be spread over the earth—"the day of darkness and gloominess," &c.,—the darkening of the sun, and the withdrawal of the light of the moon, &c. (Matt. xxiv. 29.)

Digitized by Google

darkness at all. Through this sowing time of darkness and sorrow we are passing to the reaping time of light and joy.

Ver. 4.—"And God saw the light that it was good, and God divided the light from the darkness."

On the light that was now beginning to stream in upon the earth God fixed his eye. He *saw* the light; it did not steal in unobserved; it was not too trivial to attract his notice. It is minute, noiseless, unaccompanied with vast or terrible results. Yet he looked upon it, considered it, surveyed it fully. For each stray beam of light—each twinkle of the distant star—each undulation of the atmosphere—each faint ripple of the ocean, came under the notice of his eye. He sees them all. Such is the eye of Him with whom we have to do,—the eye that searches all things—yet the eye that delights to rest in love upon each part of the workmanship of his hand.

But God not only looked upon the light;—he tells us his opinion of it. It was *good*. Such is the Divine verdict. He made it, he compounded it of its subtle elements, and therefore he knows it well. It was He who arranged its parts and proportions; it was He who twisted its seven-fold radiance; it was He who bade it shine forth in its beauty. Who, then, can speak of it as *He* can? And he calls it *good*. He approves of it, delights in it, sees it to be altogether suited to the end he had in view. It was "good" in respect of its innate excellence, "good" in respect of its beauty, "good" in respect of its usefulness; one of the fairest, most needful, and most gladdening of all his handyworks; apparently feeble, yet working mightiest wonders; altogether noiseless, yet accomplishing each moment, by its silent, secret virtue, greater results than the lightning or the hurricane; calling forth little of man's wonder or praise, yet diffusing throughout earth a greater and more continuous amount of gladness than any other of the material elements;—coming down each day upon us with reviving, refreshing, healing power. All God's creation is good, but light is especially excellent, the brightest and purest part of all. It is the only thing that cannot be soiled or stained. It corrupts not, it withers not. We may bend a sunbeam, or decompose a sunbeam, or shut it out of our dwelling, but we cannot soil it. It is the fairest, and freshest, and most heaven-like of all created things,—fittest emblem of Godhead, both of the Father and the Son.

The wise man says, "Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant

Digitized by Google

thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun." (Eccles. xi. 7.) Yes, it is even so; and what marvellous love does this betoken in our God;—love that was not dried up when sin entered, but only came out more largely in another form—that of *grace*. Though, doubtless, there has been some change in the light since the fall, some deterioration, yet still it is the most joyous thing in nature.* It might have been made so feeble as hardly to impart the needed warmth and light, or it might have been so intense (as it shall be when the fourth angel pours out his vial on the sun, Rev. xvi. 8), so as to scorch the dwellers on the earth, but it has not been so. God has so attempered it to our condition that it suits us well. And in so suiting us sinners, it preaches to us the "grace" of God. We might have been in the blackness of darkness, but we are not; and this is grace. We might have been in the everlasting burnings, but we are not; and this is grace.

And if light be so "good" even now when shining through a sin-obscured atmosphere upon a cursed earth, what will it be hereafter when coming down through the new heavens upon the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness? What will it be in the New Jerusalem, "when the glory of God shall lighten it, and the Lamb shall be the light thereof."

But next, God made a division between light and darkness. He then introduced the alternation between them which has continued ever since, the "grateful vicissitude of day and night." Now it was, perhaps, that the earth began again to revolve round its axis, God laying his finger on it and giving it the precise impulse needed. How simply is the division effected! No vast curtain alternately drawn and undrawn—no huge cloud wrapping the earth in its foldings, and again disappearing—no alternate kindling and quenching of the great source of light! God speaks, or stretches out his hand, or sends out one of these "angels that excel in strength," and the earth

* In that passage in the book of Esther which speaks of the deliverance of the Jews, we read that "the Jews had *light*, and *gladness*, and *joy*, and honour." (Esther viii. 16.) And when referring to Israel's coming days of gladness, Isaiah says, "Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself, for the Lord shall be thine everlasting *light*, and the *days of thy mourning shall be ended*." (Isa. lx. 20.) In both which, as in other passages, the connexion between light and joy on the one hand, and darkness and grief on the other, is strikingly brought out.

Digitized by Google

begins to revolve.* Thus the light and the darkness are sundered, or, rather, alternated.

In the present state of our earth, and according to the present constitution of its inhabitants (both animate and inanimate, man, animals, herbs, &c.,) this alternation is absolutely needful. A world all light would be nearly as uninhabitable and unhealthy as a world all darkness! What wisdom and grace are displayed in this division! We sometimes say, what would become of us if it were always *night?* Have we ever thought what would become of us if it were always day? We need the change, and God has kindly thought on us and provided for it, in the surest, yet the simplest of all ways—a way which, in producing this alternation,

* Milton speaks of *angels* as employed in altering the earth's position, and motions:

> "Some say he bid his angels turn askance
> The poles of earth twice ten degrees and more
> From the sun's axle; they with labour pushed
> Oblique the centric globe."—Par. Lost, b. x., line 668.

A commentator on the Apocalypse has thus finely caught up the thought: "That angels do excel in strength we well know, from Psalm ciii., and other parts of Scripture. And when the proclamation, Who is able to open the book? was to be made throughout the region of the heaven and the earth and the deep, a strong angel was chosen to lift up the creation-filling voice. Whose is it to wheel the spheres in their courses, as if they were bowling balls? Whose strength is it that splits the solid rocks, that heaves the ocean from its oozy bed, that holdeth the winds, and anon letteth them fly amain? I believe these things are under the angels. God will not leave inanimate matter to have the glory of these wonderful powers. He hath some intelligent ones, I make no doubt, who have the noble consciousness of working the will of God therein, and of rendering unto Him the homage which thence is due. This is the way in which these philosophists have dispeopled the world of intelligence, by supposing that, because they see not spiritual agencies in the mechanical and chemical regions of nature which they examine, therefore there are no such intelligences. But because we cannot see beings, whose property it is to be invisible, are there therefore no such beings? Not to see them is the very condition of their being. If we could see them, they were not. But, for my part, I believe, out of this text, that the strength—the main strength and force of things, consisteth in their subjection to mighty angels, who work the work under God, and so display the goodness—the creative goodness, and the riches of the providence of God. I reverence tradition; and I find herein the most venerable traditions of all men concurring, from the superstitions of my native land, which people the waters, and the earth, and the woods, and every thing, with invisible power and agencies, up to those of the remotest antiquity of which we have any record. In ascribing their strength unto the Lamb, therefore, I do think that these angels acknowledge all the powers which we are wont to call the powers of nature, the laws of the created world, to be due unto Him, and unto Him alone."

Digitized by Google

produces along with it a thousand other things, all pleasing and helpful. Let us praise Him for the revolving earth! Let us praise Him for the darkness as well as for the light —for the night as well as for the day! *

Ver. 5.—"And God called the light Day; and the darkness he called Night."

God does not leave his works nameless. He who made them and knew their properties and uses, gave them their names; for names are the properties or features of a being or thing expressed to the ear or eye in words, so that he who hears or reads them may at once understand what the thing or being is, and wherein it differs from other things and beings. At the outset we see how God proclaimed his own name; now he names all his creatures in succession. Of the stars we read, "He calleth them all by names." (Ps. cxlvii. 4.) He tells us how to call his works. Let us not overlook the part of God's proceedings, nor forget him as the *namer* of his works. When we speak of night or day, let us remember that He called them by these names. God does not count even the naming of his creatures beneath him. He has named the heavens and the earth; he has named the changes of light and darkness. How closely and how lovingly must his eye have rested on our world? Is there anything, great or small, of which he was or is unmindful?

Ver. 5.—"And the evening and the morning were the first day."

Thus he sums up these wondrous statements by announcing the completion of a day—of that period which embraces an evening and a morning. † He begins now to number time. "This is day the first." ‡ Thus God *dates* his operations.

* Yet the darkness which God has so graciously given for repose, and refreshment and the quiet both of the vexed soul and the weary body, man has perverted and made a covering for his sin. Deeds which he fears to do in the light he reserves for the darkness. Hence the expression "works of darkness," "children of night," and such-like; and hence the use of the term darkness for "sin;" and hence Satan is called "ruler of this world's darkness;" and hence the difference between the world and God is spoken of as that between darkness and light: "What communion hath light with darkness?" (2 Cor. vi. 14.)

† In Dan. viii. 14, the word "day" in our translation is literally "evening—morning." The Greeks have the word νυχθημερον, to denote this.

‡ Literally, "day one." Grammarians tell us that it is the cardinal number used for the ordinal (which is done both in Greek and Latin also), in commencing a series. Jerome, however, thinks there is a deeper meaning in it, "Unde et in principio Geneseos non est dictum, factum est vespere et mane dies *prima*, sed *una*; ut eandem diem revolvi semper doceat." (See on Ezek. ch. xxix. 1.)

Digitized by Google

He not only says, "I did these things," but he adds, "I did them then and there, in such a place, and at such a time." And throughout Scripture we may notice the same minute accuracy as to dates. In the prophets especially God sets down the year, the month, the day when he spoke or did such and such things. How wonderful is it to see the Eternal One thus numbering the minutest sections of time. He is truly the God of order, and arrangement, and method, and accuracy, in all things great and small. It is the fool that takes no note of time. God takes note of it, and in so doing teaches us to prize it, and to "number our days." Though he "inhabiteth eternity" (Isa. lvii. 16); though he calls himself the "Eternal God" (Deut. xxxiii 27); though a "thousand years are in his sight as yesterday" (Ps. xc. 4), yet he reckons up and names the smallest fragments of time. And He who says "before the day was, I am He" (Isa. xliii. 13), is the same who records so carefully the date of his doings as Creator,—"it was evening and it was morning, day the first."

What a marvellous day has this been! Order, light, motion, beauty, are all now begun. God has spoken the word! He has set his hand to the mighty work, and he will not rest till he has finished it, for He is the eternal purposer, and all his purposes shall stand. There can be no defeat, no reversal. This earth is to be the sphere of his mightiest work; and in these first day's operations he is gathering together the stones for the foundation of his vastest and fairest temple, which, though delayed and obstructed for a season in its erection by Satan's craft and man's sin, shall not on that account suffer loss, but shall, by this temporary frustration, have its foundations laid broader and deeper, that its walls may rise the higher, and its compass stretch the wider, in the day of final restitution still in reserve for it. Scoffers may mock, and say,—what! all this care for this little fragment of creation, this pebble on the shore of infinite space! Yes, even so. It is God's way, and shall be so to the last, alike in creation and redemption, "for the stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner."

Vers. 6—8.—"And God said, let there be a firmament (or expanse) in the midst of the waters; and let it divide the waters from the waters. 7. And God made the firmament; and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so. 8. And God called the firmament heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day."

Up to this time the atmosphere had not been sufficiently dense to bear up the evaporating waters; for there had

Digitized by Google

hitherto been two kinds of waters, the more solid waters of the abyss, and the evaporating waters rising from these. This evaporation would go on much more rapidly and incessantly if the atmosphere were *rarer* (or thinner), and yet it would not be borne up, but would rest over the immediate surface of the earth, so that there were these two bodies of water, the thicker and the thinner, the more solid and the rarer, in close conjunction with each other; the deep still throwing up its vapours, yet these vapours unable to rise, but mantling the earth with one vast watery shroud, allowing light to penetrate, yet not revealing the bright round disc of sun or moon, nor permitting the stars to shew their sparkling lustre. The scene somewhat resembled the state of earth during those months when the waters of the deluge were descending, the waters above meeting the waters beneath, and wrapping the globe round with inexhaustible rain-clouds.

God again interposes. There is need for both kinds of waters in that world which he is preparing; but they must be separate, not intermingled. There can be no life either of man, or beast, or vegetable so long as they are thus mingled. Accordingly the word goes forth; the atmosphere is made to undergo a change by which it is enabled to bear up the vapours, and thus divide the two bodies of water, while the needful process of evaporation is still carried on. This atmosphere is made to stretch round the earth like a firmament or expanse,* and bears up into its higher regions the ever-ascending waters of the lower, yet furnishing them also with the means of re-descent in the form of the gladdening shower. How simple the change! How vast and wonderful its results! Let us note the following passages in connexion with all this:—Gen. vii. 11, 12; Job xxvi. 8, and xxxvii. 11, 18; Ps. cxlviii. 4; Prov. viii. 28; Jer. x. 10—13, li. 15; Zech. xii. 1. Such are some of the references in Scripture to the two great bodies of water, upper and under, and such the way in which the division is ascribed to the *wisdom* of Jehovah; as if now his *wisdom* were specially coming forth, whereas hitherto it had been his *power* chiefly that had been seen.

God names and dates his handiwork. † He calls the

* רָקִיעַ, which our translators render firmament, the Vulgate firmamentum, and the Sept. *στερεωμα*, means a thing spread out or beaten into thinness, as the following references, in which the verb occurs, will shew:—Ex. xxxix. 3; Job xxxvii. 18; Ps. cxxxvi. 6. See an excellent note in an American work published in 1841, "A Companion to Genesis," by Dr. Samuel Turner.

† Respecting the work of the second day, it is not added, "God saw

Digitized by Google

firmament, heaven or the lofty place; and this characteristic is in many ways and figures brought under our notice in Scripture. (Job xi. 8; Ps. ciii. 21; Prov. xxv. 3; Isa. lv. 9.) The love, the power, the majesty of God, his thoughts, his ways, his purposes, when compared with those of man, are set forth to us by the height of the heaven above the earth. And in this way he gives us some faint measure of these, some poor conception of his infinite glory and grace. This heaven or firmament shared the curse when man fell, either directly, by being in itself altered for the worse, or indirectly through the curse which took possession of the soil and exhaled into the mantling air. There is something in earth's atmosphere that blights and injures. It is not the same healthful, genial, joyous firmament that it was when God created it. And this deterioration has doubtless contributed to the decay of creation, to the propagation of disease, and to the curtailment of life; as if the seeds of death were in it after the fall as largely as were the elements of life before. After the deluge it became yet more deteriorated, and man's life became shortened,—gradually shortening in its dates till it reached the threescore years and ten. Since that time it has remained the same, and probably will do so during the short remaining period of earth's fallen state. We do indeed read of a period when the seventh angel is to pour out his vial into the air (Rev. xvi. 7) as if *its* crisis had come; so that having been brought into its worst condition, it was preparing to put on its best,—just as death is our way to resurrection-glory,—but how far this is connected with the curse or its removal we cannot say.* After this, the firmament is made new; for just as there is a renewal of the earth, so there is a renewal of the encompassing atmosphere. This upper part of creation must partake in the deliverance from "the bondage of corruption." This renovation of the firmament will contribute to the superior brightness of sun and moon, which millennial days are to witness; and it will contribute to the restored longevity of man on earth when his days shall be "as the days of a tree." (Isa. lxv. 22.) How many of the groans of creation will this restoration, this healing of the firmament, still! What health to the body,

that it was good." It does not appear why. Jerome's absurdity about *two* being an unclean number, *immundus numerus*, only shows the difficulty which commentators have felt in accounting for this omission.

* The angel's pouring out his vial into the air may point both to the natural and spiritual crisis in the history of that part of creation, and indicate that the time is come when not only physical evils are to be purged out, but the spiritual wickedness in high places expelled.

Digitized by Google

what vigour to the soul of man will it tend to impart, when the primeval blessing is renewed, which man's sin had so long restrained! What new strength, yet also what new gentleness of nature will it bring to the animal creation! What new verdure to the leaf, what new beauty and fragrance to the flower will it impart! What a change in the blue of the heavens and in the green of the earth, when this long-poisoned air is at length disinfected by the healing touch of Him who has disease, with all its varied sources, seen and unseen, at his command,—who, when on earth, shewed Himself as the world's great healer, and whose voice shall then be heard saying, "Behold, I make all things new."

It is in this old firmament, this defiled atmosphere of ours, that Satan has taken up his abode. How the darkness became his peculiar birthright we know not. How or when he was permitted to take up his abode in the air so as to become "the prince of the power of the air," and thence to wield the darkness, which is his heritage, we know not. We know simply that it is so. The encompassing air of earth is Satan's special residence and domain. From it he "rains his plagues on men like dew." In it he has set his throne, and from that throne he rules this world and its kingdoms, sending down his legions to scour the earth, to reinforce his citadels, to assail the Church, to form the body-guard of Antichrist, to lead men captive at his will, till the day arrive when he shall be cast down from his seat and bound in the dark abyss for a thousand years, in preparation for the "outer darkness," in which he is to dwell for ever. And who, believing these things, can look up into the fair yet wan azure without longing for the time when its sickliness shall be exchanged for the intensity of brightness? Who, remembering that it is the haunt of Satan and his angels, can gaze into its depths, either of midnight or of noon, without longing for the time when he shall be cast out, and these old haunts of his purified and filled with blessed angels carrying on their glad ministry both in the upper and lower regions of God's redeemed creation?

It is into the air that the saints are to be caught up to meet their re-appearing Lord. In the progress of his descent to earth, He halts there with his angelic retinue; and pitching his pavilion on the confines of earth, he calls up his saints to meet Him,—there to hear the final sentence of "no condemnation" announced, to celebrate the completed union, to sit down at the marriage-

Digitized by Google

supper, and to begin the long festivity of the bridal day.*

Ver. 9.—"And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. 10. And God called the dry land, Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good."

No change had, as yet, taken place upon the mighty mass of waters, which, like one vast and unbroken ocean, covered the whole earth. It was still in the condition referred to in the 104th Psalm, "Thou coveredst it with the deep as with a garment: the waters stood above the mountains." It was truly "the melancholy main." There was no life, no joy, no intercourse of happy being. If, then, the earth is to be the dwelling-place of life, there must be a change. These waters must, in part at least, be dried up. They are not wholly to pass off; for they are needful in many ways. They are needful for *beauty*, and God considers this in all his works. They are needful for supplying the atmosphere with vapours, and the earth with showers, as well as for filling the rivers which fertilize and gladden it. They are not indeed needful to the extent in which they now exist; and hence in the new earth they shall be largely curtailed, if not wholly done away. (Rev. xxi. 1.) But though in a measure needful, they must be changed, and their limits abridged. The land which they cover must rise above the surface, and become a fit habitation for man. *How* this was done we are not told. God said, "Let it be, and it was so." It is but a word and all is done. This one word went, like lightning, through the deep foundations of earth, upheaving some parts into mountains, sinking others into valleys or deeper receptacles for the ocean. The process is so far described in Ps. civ. 9, &c.; and in reference to the thing itself we have such allusions as the following;—

* These verses give us one of the first intimations of the distinction which Scripture preserves throughout between "the earthly" and "the heavenly," the upper and the lower chamber of the palace of the great King, this earth the lower, these skies, (the floor of a more glorious heaven) the upper. At present it is full of ungodliness, it lies εν τω πονηρω; and the air is full of unclean spirits. But God's purpose must be fulfilled, and the day is coming when both shall be purged; when earth and heaven shall be re-united; when the ladder of communication between the upper and the lower region shall be set up (Gen. xxviii. 12; John i. 51), when, in the Jerusalem above, the risen saints shall dwell; and in the Jerusalem below, Israel shall abide; and over the whole blessed earth, now delivered from the curse, shall dwell the nations of the saved, rejoicing in the double splendour of the upper and the lower glory, filling the new firmament with the odours of their incense, and the harmony of their songs.

Digitized by Google

Job xxvi. 10, xxxviii. 8; Ps. xxxiii. 7; xcv. 5, cxxxvi. 6; Prov. viii. 29; Jer. v. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 5. Thus it is that God refers to his operations, giving us indeed but little insight into the actual process, yet finely painting and spreading out before us its great features.

The two parts of the globe, thus formed, received their names from God, the dry land being called *earth,* and the gathering of the waters *seas.** God then looked upon his handiwork, surveying it in all its parts, and then pronounced it "good." The earth was "good," as it now spread itself out in all its inequalities of valley and mountain, of plain and precipice. A goodly earth! Fit to be the dwelling of creatures made in his own image; fit to be the material out of which the bodies of these creatures were to be fashioned; nay, fit to be the material out of which the body of his own Son was to be composed when He took flesh in the virgin's womb. A goodly sea! Goodly in its stretch of illimitable vastness, and in its transparent depths of unpolluted blue; goodly in the grandeur of its deafening storms, and in the still more wondrous grandeur of its majestic calms; goodly in all its moods whether of gloom or gladness, whether shadowed with the cloud, or spanned with the rainbow, or reflecting the sky's clear azure, or bathed in sunshine, or silvered with the moonbeam, or strewn with starlight, whether breaking in surges against the rock, or stealing in soft ripples over the glittering sand.†

If sea and earth be thus "good," according to God's own judgment, there can be no inherent evil in matter, as philosophy would teach. Matter is not in itself carnal. It is not the corrupter of spirit. It was created good, and it cannot corrupt itself. It is spirit that has done this. It is spirit, not matter, that is the fountain-head of evil.

What a world is this of ours for scenes and associations,

* Robertson, in his "Clavis," derives אֶרֶץ from a word signifying to be low, as contrasting with the heavens; but Pirie says that it is derived from a word to run, and thinks that the term refers to its motion round the sun, as well as round its axis. "Essay on Creation-week, and its symbolical intention," p. 7. Gesenius makes ימים to indicate the boiling or foaming of the sea, while Robertson gives as its meaning, *recta extendit.*

† We may notice some things connected with this part of creation. (1) God is very often spoken of as Maker of heaven and earth and sea, and as such to be praised. Ps. xcv. 4—6, cxxxvi. 6; Rev. xiv. 7. (2) The wicked are compared to the troubled sea. Isa. lvii. 20. (3) It is symbolically the place whence the four great beasts come up. Dan. vii. 3. (4) It is the emblem of vastness. Job xi. 9. (5) Of tumult. Ps. lxv. 7. (6) Of instability. James i. 6.

Digitized by Google

and remembrances! Earth and sea are full of them; evil and good, sorrowful and glad. What feet have trod this earth, what eyes have gazed on that sea, since God brought them into being! Here holy men have lived; here the wicked have triumphed; here Abel's blood was shed; here Enoch walked with God; here angels have been visitors; here the Son of God abode, his footsteps were on the earth and on the sea. It is a small enough speck in the map of the universe, but it is the most wondrous of all. And though it has felt the curse for a season, it is to taste the blessing again. And when the mighty angel is seen descending to claim the heritage (Rev. x. 2), he sets his right foot on the sea, and his left upon the earth, in token of his having come to take possession of all things which God at first created.

The earth and sea are now the depositories of the dead. The bodies both of the holy and the unholy are resting there. But the day is near when out of that earth and that sea, the trumpet shall call the dead. Neither shall be able to detain their victims when the life-giving voice shall be heard. (John v. 28, 29; Rev. xx. 13.) In the dust of earth, or deep beneath the roar of ocean, the saint sleeps soundly, as in a peaceful bed, till Jesus come. In that same dust, or beneath these same cold surges, the sinner lies, like the criminal in his cell, awaiting the summons of the Judge.

Ver. 11.—And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass,* the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth, and it was so. 12. And the earth brought forth grass and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself, after his kind; and God saw that it was good. 13. And the evening and the morning were the third day."

The great work proceeds apace. We are made to trace its successive steps, rising the one above the other, in fair order. There was first *light*, followed by the division into day and night. Then there was the *atmosphere*, followed by the division of the upper and the under waters. Then the *earth*, with its division into sea and land, so that a soil was prepared, with all the needful accompaniments and appliances for making it productive. This having been done, the word goes forth, and the clothing of the earth begins, with the two great divisions of grass and trees, the smaller and the larger order of the vegetable creation. All these sprung up at once

* Literally, "let the earth sprout forth grass of green herbage (*Βοτανην χορτου*, as the Seventy give it), seeding seed; tree of fruit, making fruit after its kind."

Digitized by Google

when the divine command went out.* And in this first generation there is contained provision for all future time, each class being so created as to be able to *reproduce itself*. They could not produce others of a different kind, or gradually pass up from a lower into a higher order; each could only bring forth his own. Each species was to be separate from the other, bringing forth seed "after its kind." There was to be no confusion, no intermingling of diverse kinds. Such was the law of the Creator, and in the carrying out of that law, no mistakes occur, and no rebellion is ever seen. Man may mistake or resist the law, but into the lower parts of creation these things cannot come. All there is order, certainty, continuity, and regularity of the most perfect kind. There is a law woven into every fibre of their being—a law from which no power or skill can force them to deviate. In that law we read the will of God himself—a will stamped upon all creation, and meeting us in every clod of the soil, and in every herb, or flower, or tree. Why does this seed bring forth only grass, and that other only corn, and that other only the shrub or tree? Because God so willed it at first, and because he has left the stamp of that sovereign will upon the minutest seed that ripens under the Autumn sun. Why do they never run into each other, and become mixed or confounded, but every where preserve the original diversity assigned to them six thousand years ago, so that when at any time man with all his skill fails to discriminate different seeds, he has but to appeal to these seeds themselves, by covering them with a little moist soil, and forthwith each seed declares itself without mistake or uncertainty. Because in each of these atoms of creation there is a force at work, far superior to man—the will of Jehovah. Why does not the acorn sometimes through mistake produce the elm, or the fir-cone the chesnut, or the thistle-down the rose of Sharon? Why does not the fig-tree sometimes pass into the vine, or the branching cedar shoot up into naked stateliness, and put on the coronet of the palm? In all these myriads of seeds

* Milton thus describes the scene:—

"He scarce had said, when the bare earth, till then
Desert and bare, unsightly, unadorned,
Brought forth the tender grass, whose verdure clad
Her universal face with pleasant green."—Book vii. 313.

The description of Lucretius is so exact that we may cite it,—

"Principio genus herbarum, viridemque nitorem,
Terra dedit, circum colles, camposque per omnes
Florida fulserunt viridanti prata colore."—De Rer. Nat., b. v. 781.

Digitized by Google

there is oftentimes abortion, but never a mistake. The seed may rot and die, so failing in its end, but otherwise it fails not. In a perfect world there would be no abortion or decay, but this world of ours is blighted, and therefore failure exists. But it is simply failure, not mistake. It is Jehovah's will that they should often prove abortive, in order to be a witness to sin and the curse; but it is also His will that there should be no mistake or confusion, that it may be seen, even in the lowliest, that He is still the sovereign of creation. Thus has God engraven the insignia of his sovereignty upon all his handiworks, even the minutest. The form and colour of each seed, each leaf, each blossom—all these continuing to this day without mixture or confusion, are the badges of his sovereignty as well as the witnesses of his wisdom and love.

This day's work, which God pronounces good, and which he *dates*, as in other places, may be called either the clothing or the painting of creation. Figure, size, proportion, had all been given before, but still earth was a dark-brown mass of mingled soil and rock. But now the command goes out for its adornment. For God's purpose is to make it a world of beauty as well as of stability, seeing He is himself the possessor and source of all that is beautiful. He chooses *blue* for the colour of sky and sea, but he chooses *green* for the hue of earth. His word spreads over its varied surface the green mantle which has from that day to this made it to be known as the "green earth." *

Vers. 14—19.—"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night (between the day and between the night); and let them be for signs and for seasons (set times), and for days and years. 15. And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth. And it was so. 16. And God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also. 17. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth;

* Let us notice two special references to earth's greenness. In Song of Sol. vi. 11, the Spouse says, "I went down into the garden of nuts to see the *greenness* of the valley," for it is greenness, not fruit, that is signified by the word (see Job viii. 12); the *beauty* of the *green* valley is what is referred to. In Rev. iv. 3, the rainbow round the throne was "to look upon like an emerald." As the emerald is green, so the symbolical rainbow, all tinctured with that hue, declares the connexion of the scene mentioned in the chapter with the *green earth*. It seems like the reflected verdure of earth formed into a canopy above the throne to shew that he who sat upon the throne was earth's Redeemer and King. That emerald rainbow is God's covenant-pledge to creation that he remembers it, and will ere long restore to it its blighted verdure.

Digitized by Google

18. and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. 19. And the evening and the morning were the fourth day."

There had been *light* * before, but there are to be *lights;* the light hitherto had been dimly diffused over creation. Its *source* has not yet become visible. The firmament was still clouded, so that neither sun nor moon could be seen; and it was under this cloud that God sowed his seed, and planted his herbs and trees. But now the veil is to be brushed away, and the two great centres of radiance to become visible. They, with the stars, had been created at first, as parts of the heaven and earth spoken of in the first verse. But not till now are they unveiled; for now they are needed to nourish and mature the springing plants of herb and tree, which God had, on the previous day, been planting. The operations of the third day suited best the *shade,* but now something more is required, and the sun bursts forth in its strength. But let us more particularly mark the uses here assigned to these luminaries.

1. The first use is to divide between the day and between the night. Here again the process of *division* comes in, the sun and moon being the instruments for effecting it. This division is not arbitrary or useless. Man's health and comfort require it. The well-being of all the various tribes of being, living or lifeless, requires this. Without it the present condition of creation would be undermined, and creation ere long destroyed. Without it there could be no order, no regularity. When day and night are confounded, then man suffers; for no law of creation can be violated without suffering or evil following. But, while man neglects this regularity of division at the call either of pleasure or business, God keeps up his silent protest in the heavens against him. He prevents that disorder from becoming general by the fixture of the heavenly orbs, whose inexorable law of revolution is always bringing back order and regularity, restraining the folly and disorderliness of man.

* In Psalm lxxiv. 16, the distinction between the light, and the source of light, is marked, while both are ascribed to God: "Thou hast prepared light and the sun." The words of the cxxxvi. Psalm are a commentary on the whole passage, teaching us, moreover, the infinite love of God in this part of his creation, so that we cannot enjoy the brightness of sun, or moon, or star, without feeling that "his mercy endureth for ever." Everlasting mercy is written on these great lights of the firmament. And as truly as they tell his love, so truly do they "declare his glory." (Ps. xix. 1.)

Digitized by Google

2. *To be for signs and for seasons, for days and for years.* (1.) *Signs;* that is tokens, by means of which God points to something not before the eye, past, present, or to come, as the rainbow after the flood, or as the Sabbath, which was to be a "sign." These heavenly bodies are specially to be used as "signs" in the latter day. (Luke xxi. 25; Acts ii. 19.) (2.) *Seasons;* that is, set times, not only the seasons of the year, but festivals and solemn days; all the recurring periods of man's time, great or small. (Isa. lxvi. 23; 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; Ps. civ. 19.) Thus God has committed the keeping of man's time to the unintelligent, nay, the inanimate creation. The sun and moon keep time for man; he cannot do it for himself; and the regularity of the world as to *time* must be intrusted to creatures without mind or life. Much as man can do, he cannot keep or measure his time without their aid. He can construct an instrument for this, or he can let the sun or moon do it for him; but without some such appliances he soon loses all count of time. Thus, at every turn man's helplessness comes out, and he is made to feel his littleness as well as his greatness; his dependance on the inanimate creation as well as his superiority to it.

3. *To give light.* Several times over this is stated, as if it were their prime and special object, to which the others were subordinate. They are man's servants—his torch-bearers, appointed for this service by God.* They shine not for themselves, but for him. It is towards him that each ray is bending, as if doing homage to its King. Yet man in his folly has worshipped the light as if it were God! The master has bowed down to the servant! Oh, folly and stupidity beyond conception! Man alone mistakes or forgets the end of his creation; other creatures, even the inanimate, fulfil their end!

4. *To rule the day and night.*†—Each has his royal throne

* Is not this the special reference in the 8th Psalm, when David exclaims, "What is man that thou art mindful," &c. It is not merely to contrast the magnificence of the starry arch with the meanness of man, as is generally supposed. It is rather to ask, what is man that thou shouldst make such provision for his comfort and well-being as these skies do furnish! What is man that thou shouldst light up so many sparkling orbs to give light to him! In reference to the stars being man's servants, Theodoret has somewhere this idea, that they turn their back upon the heavens in order to give light to the earth—*νῶτα διδόντας ὀυρανῷ.*

† As each of the six periods is measured from the evening to the morning, the *moon* must have appeared first. In that night when her face was first unveiled she began her less potent rule, and it was not till

Digitized by Google

assigned. They sit like monarchs in the firmament, determining the bounds of day and night; that the light may not encroach upon the darkness, nor the darkness on the light, but each have its allotted share of time. They sit also there as if to regulate the movements of man, prescribing to him what these movements are to be during the day, and during the night,—saying to man, each morning, Arise, and go forth to thy labour; and each evening, Return and rest. Thus these "powers that be" (emblems of the princedoms of earth) "are ordained of God." It is his purpose that they are fulfilling; it is by his law that they are moving, and revolving, and radiating, carrying healing and gladness, as well as light, along with them,—being to man "the ministers of God for good."

In all this we see again the impress of Jehovah's sovereign will. It is that will that shines out in the day, or darkens in the night. It is that will that is to be traced in the hours, and days, and weeks, and months, and years, and cycles, that give to earth and its inhabitant (man) a chronology and a history. To all this God sets his seal. It was good. And again, He dates his work, "the evening was, and the morning was, day the fourth." *

Vers. 20—25.—" And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly, the moving creature that hath life (*lit.*, let the waters make to creep the creeping thing, soul of life, *i. e.*, that has life in it); and fowl that may fly above the earth on the open firmament of heaven; (*lit.*, and let fowl fly upon or above the earth on the face of the expanse of the heavens.) 21. And God created great whales (*lit.*, the great sea-monsters), and every living creature that moveth (or creepeth), which

---

morning that the sun burst forth. So it is first the Church, "fair as the moon," shining in and ruling this world's deep midnight, till the morning wanes and the long-hidden Sun of Righteousness goes forth "like a bridegroom out of his chamber," to take his place in the firmament, and with his bride, the Church, to rule the endless day.

* It is interesting to notice the many applications made in Scripture of the heavenly bodies as emblems of the spiritual. (1.) God is a sun and shield (Ps. lxxxiv. 11). (2.) Christ is the sun of righteousness (Mal. iv. 2); the light of the world (John viii. 12); the morning star (Rev. ii. 16); the dispeller of the darkness (2 Sam. xxiii. 4). (3.) The Church is fair as the moon (Song vi. 10); clear as the sun (Song vi. 10); the moon under her feet (Rev. xii. 1); crowned with stars (ib.); the saints are to shine as the stars (Dan. xii. 3); with different glories (1 Cor. xv. 41); as the sun in his might (Judges v. 31); as the sun in the kingdom of their father (Matt. xiii. 43. (4.) Christ's ministers are likened to stars (Rev. i. 16—20). (5.) Apostates are likened to wandering stars (Jude 13). (6.) It was a star that lighted the wise men (Matt. ii. 2). (7.) At the coming crisis of earth's history, all these heavenly orbs are to be shaken and darkened for a season (Mark xiii. 25).

Digitized by Google

the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl (*lit.*, every fowl of wing) after his (its) kind; and God saw that it was good. 22. And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let the fowl multiply on the earth. 23. And the evening and the morning were the fifth day. 24. And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature (*lit.*, the soul of life), after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth, after his kind; and it was so. 25. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind. And God saw that it was good."

We have seen the creation of vegetable life, we have now to mark that of animal life. We are now climbing upwards in the scale of being, yet each step is a distinct one. There is no confusion nor intermingling with each other. The rock does not gradually become a vegetable, and the vegetable gradually pass into an animal. No. There is entire separation in each class, and at every step the fiat of the Creator must come in. They cannot, by any innate power, or intermixture of species or development of latent power or capacity create or produce each other. The stone remains the stone, however rough, and the gem remains the gem, however precious. The tree remains the tree, neither passing downwards into something less, nor upwards into something higher. The flower abides the flower, neither casting off its petals and shrinking into a clod, nor expanding its blossoms into the plumage of the dove or the eagle. On each, God has imprinted the law of its kind, which it cannot pass nor annul.

God first *created*, then He *arranged*, then He *enlightened*, then He *divided*, then He *clothed*, then He *regulated time;* now He proceeds to *people* the earth. Up to this time it might be fair and goodly, but it was unpeopled. No life was to be found on it. Now it is to be peopled by what are called "things having a soul of life," or living soul. The inanimate creation had been completed, the animate must now be proceeded with. In this the order of procedure is, first, the creatures belonging to the sea; second, those belonging to the air; third, those belonging to the earth. This was the order in which these three parts or regions of creation were prepared, and so the same order is preserved when providing inhabitants for them.

1. *The creatures of the sea.*—These we know are the lowest in the scale of creation, so God begins with these. And all species which the sea contains He creates at once; from the great sea-monsters down to the meanest reptile. God himself gives us in the Book of Job (ch. xli.), a description of Leviathan as a specimen of these. (See also Ps. civ. 26.)

Digitized by Google

How mighty in power and manifold in wisdom must their Creator be! On every element He has representatives of his might and majesty. In the rugged caves of ocean there are creatures to glorify Him, so that the "dragons and all deeps" are called on to praise Him. (Ps. clviii. 7.) And from the depths of ocean there comes up a hallelujah to Him "who alone doeth great wonders; for whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did He in heaven and in earth—*in the seas and all deep places.*" (Ps. cxxxv. 6.) Nay, the voice which John heard ascribing blessing to the Lamb for ever, was from "such as are in the sea, and all that are in them." (Rev. v. 13.)

2. *The creatures of the air.*—We take the marginal reading as the true one, "let the fowl fly," &c., that is, let the fowl be created, and let them fly in the firmament, there taking up their abode. Of these two, God has given his own description (Job xxxix. 13—26, 27), singling out specially the peacock, the ostrich, the hawk, and the eagle. Thus the air is vocal. It has a hallelujah of its own. The "flying fowl" praise him (Ps. clvii. 10); whether it be "the stork that knoweth her appointed time" (Jer. viii. 7), or the "sparrow alone upon the house top" (Ps. cii. 7), or "the raven of the valley" (Prov. xxx. 17), or the eagle "stirring up her nest, and fluttering over her young" (Deut. xxxii. 11), or the turtle making its voice to be heard in the land (Song ii. 12), or the dove winging its way to the wilderness. (Ps. lxv. 6.) This is creation's harp (truer and sweeter than Memnon's), which each sunrise awakens, "turning all the air to music."

3. *The creatures of the earth.*—The beast, the cattle, the creeping thing; all that the earth now rears upon its bosom. Of these also God has given us his description (Job xxxix. 1—12, 19), proclaiming his wondrous works. Thus earth too has her hallelujah, for "beasts and all cattle" (Ps. clviii. 10), are summoned to join in the chorus, that the diapason of creation may be complete.

Thus sea, air, earth, are peopled, the three regions referred to in Psalm viii., which is quoted by the apostle (Heb. ii.), as so specially containing man's charter, and setting forth God's purpose. The "soul of life" has now been given,—sentient beings have taken up their abode on earth,—beings capable of suffering and rejoicing. It is in LIFE that God is now manifesting himself. Hitherto it has been in order, in shape, in colour, in beauty,—now it is in *life*,—that which is nearest to his own nature, likest to himself. The manifestation which it is his purpose to make of Himself is becoming more and more complete.

Digitized by Google

He blesses them, and pronounces them "good." He pours into them all the blessing of which their nature is capable, and gives it to them in perpetuity. For when God blesses his creatures, He is looking forward into the far future, and securing to them all that that future stands in need of. And having blessed them, He bids them multiply, as if He would point out that the blessing which He gives is an active and communicative blessing, to be spread abroad. And here we learn that the propagative powers of creation are the direct impartation of God. They are not a mere natural property or physical law, but the special gift of God. His Sovereign will, his authoritative command are here. Fruitfulness and barrenness, the power to increase, or the drying up of that power, are from his hand! And hence it is that David gives vent to his joyful confidence, "O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast; how excellent is thy loving-kindness, O God, therefore the children of men put their trust in the shadow of thy wings." (Ps. xxxvi. 7.) And hence also, after surveying the work of God's hands, he thus concludes: "I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live: I will sing praise to my God, while I have any being. My meditation of Him shall be sweet: I will be glad in the Lord." (Ps. civ. 33, 34.)

Ver. 26.—"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air (*lit.*, heaven), and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. 27. So (*lit.*, and) God created man (*lit.*, the man) in his own image; in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them. 28. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish (fill) the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth (*lit.*, creepeth) upon the earth. 29. And God said, Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed (*lit.*, all grass seeding seed), which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed (*lit.*, seeding seed); to you it shall be for meat. 30. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air (*lit.*, heavens), and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life (*lit.*, the soul of life), I have given every green herb for meat; and it was so. 31. And God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day."

The great temple of creation has now been reared and roofed in. It is perfect in its kind,—a glorious manifestation of its glorious Maker. But it wants a worshipper. It is at best but splendid desolation—a silent, though wondrous city of the dead.

There must be a living inhabitant, and a living worshipper.

Digitized by Google

God cannot rest in his work till this is done. And, accordingly, the completion of the work proceeds. But it is the most important part, and must be planned with care. The great idea has been in the Divine mind from eternity, and is now to be executed; but in a way which manifests the profound interest which God took in what He was about to do. Hitherto it has been but the swift forth-going of a command; now there is a consultation, as if God were solemnly deliberating upon the great design. Hitherto it had been, "Let there be;" now it is, "Let us make;"—it is not a command to the elements, to bring forth what they contain; it is a work, spoken of as specially God's own. The creature to be formed must come more directly from the Divine hand than any other; and hence we often read elsewhere, "He made us, and not we ourselves."

And with whom is this consultation held? "With whom took He counsel?" Not with angels surely. But with Himself—Father, Son, and Spirit. The peculiar form of expression is not made use of without a purpose. And this is the more to be noted, because afterwards, when each of the Three Persons had come out, as it were, into greater distinctness of manifestation, so that sometimes the Father speaks, and at other times the Son, and at other times the Spirit, this plural form of speech is not made use of. It is always I, not we. The same remarks apply to the use of the word *our*, immediately after.

The being, about whose formation this consultation was held, was he to whom the name of *man* was to be given, as we read, "He called their name Adam (or man), in the day when they were created." (Ch. v. 2.) The word signifies red, or ruddy, referring to the colour of his flesh, either as it appears under the skin, or as it is seen shining through the skin, forming the bright complexion of health, and is the token of perfect and vigorous manhood and womanhood. And hence it is said of Christ, who in body, as well as soul, was the perfection of manhood, "He that sat on it was to look upon, like a jasper and a sardine stone." (Rev. iv. 3.) It is the same word used in the following passages:—1 Sam. xvi. 12: "He was *ruddy* and withal of a beautiful countenance;" Song, v. 10, "My beloved is white and *ruddy;*" Lam. iv. 7, "Her Nazarites were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were more *ruddy* in body than rubies; their polishing was of sapphire."

This being is to be made "in our image, after our likeness;" (this is repeated in verse 27). The use of both image

Digitized by Google

and likeness is not a repetition. Its meaning is, "Let us make man in our image," in order that he may resemble us, and so be our representative, the reflector of our image to others." The two words are used in Exod. xx. 4, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything," that is, anything intended to resemble or represent anything whatever on earth. God's special characteristics may be summed up in these: intelligence, holiness, blessedness. Man, therefore, was to be an intelligent, holy, blessed being,—in these great features differing from and rising above all that had hitherto been created. (See 1 Cor. xi. 7; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10.) The idea of some, that the image of God consisted in his having dominion, is one resting on no Scripture, and is disproved by the passage before us, in which the possession of dominion is described as the *result* of his having the image, and so could not be the image itself. Man was to be God's king, *because* he was fitted to be so by being made in the image of God.

Then the gift of dominion follows. This kingship was directly from God. It was unlimited in so far as earth was concerned. All things were put under Him, setting before us at the outset the great truth that it was God's purpose to rule the earth by a king, and that king, not an angel, but a man. (Heb. ii.) The further exercise of this dominion is afterwards expressed by "subduing the earth," bringing everything into submission to his royal will, and into conformity with God's plan and purpose. Not as if there was to be *resistance* to man in any part of creation, requiring coercion, but merely such a kind of resistance as he was to have in cultivating Eden; such a kind of resistance as implied that creation stood waiting for the utterance of his will, and the forth-putting of his power.

Then there comes the blessing (verse 28). God blessed them, that is, He poured into them all the goodness, and the life, and the joy that they could contain, and declared that such as they were just now, such they were to be in time to come. This is the filling of the vessel, according to its measure, with the fulness of God. In virtue of this blessing, they were to be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth. And here, as we noticed formerly, is the true source of all power of propagation in man or beast, in herb or flower. The earth at first was "void," or empty, but now it was to be "filled."

Then food is granted. All that the earth brings forth of herb and tree. It would seem by the statement of the 30th

Digitized by Google

verse, that the beasts and fowl were restricted to the herb of the field, while to man was specially assigned the fruit of the tree. That man was restricted to the latter cannot be said; but the special food befitting his higher nature was the fruit of the tree. No *life* was then taken for food; life did not need to be supported by death. Death was not then a necessary prerequisite to any creatures obtaining food for the body. The lion did eat straw like the ox, as it did even afterwards, in the ark, during the year of confinement there. Such was the Divine law, and such was the true condition of creation ere sin had disordered the earth.

Then, when all is finished, God looked round upon his handiwork, surveying all its parts. He gives his verdict,—"very good." He is well pleased, and He tells us this. Such is his estimate of creation. It is all perfect, all according to his plan and mind, each of its parts exhibiting the idea which He designed. And again He dates his work, "the evening was, and the morning was, day the sixth."

And is this the six days' work that we see around us? Yes; but how changed! It is not wholly ruined, for God has interrupted it in its fall, so that by its midway position it should point forward to restitution while it proclaims decay. But still it is not what God made it, and man is its destroyer! It is man that has made creation groan. It is man that is the undoer of what the great Maker had done.

And man himself, what is he now? The image of Elohim,—where is it? Marred, faded, gone! A few fragments still remaining—a few torn leaves to show what has been the flower! We cannot recognise him as the same being. Man, "thou hast destroyed thyself!" Compare thy present and thy former self, and be ashamed. Let the contrast between the first Adam and thyself humble thee profoundly; and let the contrast between the Second Adam and thyself humble thee more profoundly still. The contrast, how sad! The ruin, how awful! And *you* did it!

Retrace your steps—get back the lost image—get it back in God's way. Thy connexion with the first Adam is thy undoing—nothing but connexion with the Second can be thy salvation. "Put on Christ;" let every lineament of the earthly Adam be erased; let each feature of the heavenly Adam be engraven upon thee. Aim high; yet not in pride, as man did, and fell. To have the image of God is one thing; and it is right and blessed; to "be as God" is another, and it is awfully presumptuous,—it is self-deification, and has been the ruin of the race. The day of perfection, and restoration,

Digitized by Google

and dominion, is coming; but it is not yet arrived. Live looking for it; live as men who believe it; walk worthy of it. It will then be seen what a God of glory our God is, and what blessedness there is in being knit to the Second Adam, who shall then be manifested as the head of creation, and the King of Glory.

Art. III.—ISAIAH XXVIII.

The fall of Samaria is evidently the occasion of this prophecy. That event took place according to the received chronology, about the year B. C. 727. It was the first great crisis in the history of God's chosen people—the beginning of the accomplishment of the threatenings which had been denounced against disobedience, and the pledge of the fulfilment of the whole of them. It is the first point, therefore, around which cluster the predictions of that line of prophets from Jonah to Malachi, who were raised up to foretel coming retribution. And this chapter affords an excellent example of the method in which these prophecies are constructed. The Seer looks forth into the future: the day of the Lord fills all his view; a day of darkness and gloominess. Destroyers hasten to their prey: the Assyrian, it may be, or the Chaldean, or the Roman, or the great Antichrist of the latter days. Gleams of hope shoot at times athwart the vision, but the gathering clouds return, and all is darkness and woe. Still there is consolation for a remnant. The Messiah comes: the darkness is dispelled at his presence: He is manifested as the King of his people: their enemies are destroyed: the heathen are judged round about; and the whole earth filled with the glory of the Lord.

Isaiah, then, looking forward to the destruction of the kingdom of the ten tribes, thus begins:

Ver. 1.—Ah! the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim: and a fallen flower (is) the beauty of his glory, which (is) on the head of the fat valley of the wine-smitten.

The aptness of the description of Samaria given in this verse, has often been admired. It was built on a lofty hill, surrounded by a plain of great fertility, and its inhabitants seem to have exulted in the amenity and strength of its situation. "Woe," says the prophet, "to them that are at ease in Zion, and trust in the mountain of Samaria." (Amos, vi. 1.) It is therefore called the crown, the flower, the ornament of

Digitized by Google

beauty. It is generally supposed that there is an allusion to the garlands worn by revellers; ציץ however, is used for the plate of the holy crown of the priest (Exod. xxxix. 30; Lev. viii. 9), and perhaps signifies the ornamental flower-work about a crown. נבל may signify either fading or fallen; the subsequent context determines in favour of the latter. הוי does not always signify "Woe." See, for example, Isa. x. 5; lv. 1, &c.

Ver. 2—4.—Behold, might and strength are the Lord's: as a hail storm, a tempest of destruction; as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, he shall cast it to the earth with the hand. Under the feet shall be trodden down the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim. And a fallen flower shall be the beauty of his glory, which is on the head of the fat valleys; like the first ripe fig before the harvest, which he that sees it sees, and while it is yet on the branch he swallows it.

The authorized version, "The Lord hath a mighty and strong one," agrees perfectly with the Hebrew, but it seems preferable to take the adjectives as abstract nouns. The closing simile expresses the suddenness and completeness of Samaria's desolation, like an early fig hastily eaten from the branch: for such seems the meaning of כף, which in Levit. xxiii. 40, signifies branches of palm trees, and is used with that meaning in several places in its feminine form. The denunciation of Samaria is now ended, and the prophet turns to Judah.

Ver. 5, 6.—In that day shall Jehovah of hosts be for a crown of beauty, and a diadem of glory, to the remnant of his people: and for a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment, and for strength to them that turn the battle to the gate.

The "day" here spoken of is, by some of the Jewish commentators, interpreted of the day of Messiah; but the context seems to require that it should be understood of the time immediately succeeding Samaria's overthrow, for the contrast is evidently between those whose "crown," "beauty," and "glory," was Samaria, and those who on the other hand should exalt Jehovah. The remnant of God's people, therefore, here spoken of, must be the kingdom of Judah, after the ten tribes were carried into captivity. Their blessedness in God's favour may be referred to the revival of religion in the days of Hezekiah, although, perhaps, the prophet also glances at a more full accomplishment of the prediction in later times. This revival, however, would not be permanent.

Ver. 7, 8.—But even they through wine have erred, and through strong drink have gone astray. Priest and prophet have erred through strong

Digitized by Google

drink; have been swallowed up through wine; have gone astray through strong drink, have erred in vision, have staggered in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit (and) filth, without a clean place.

The luxury and earthliness which had been the ruin of Israel, would also be found in Judah. No doubt literal drunkenness is here intended, but it is adduced as indicating their character as besotted rejecters of the truth. So we find it used in Hos. vii. 5, "In the day of our king the princes have made him sick with bottles of wine; *he stretched out his hand with scorners.*" So again in Isai. lvi. 10-12, "His watchmen are *blind:* they are all *ignorant* .... Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink." And in Isaiah xxix. 9, spiritual drunkenness is evidently spoken of:—"They are drunken but not with wine; they stagger but not with strong drink." In these verses the prophet, we conceive, connects the times succeeding Hezekiah's reformation with those of our Lord's ministry, intimating that the character of the people remained unchanged. When the Redeemer came they "loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

Ver. 9.—Whom will he teach knowledge, and whom will he make to understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk, and removed from the breasts.

These words appear to apply to our Saviour's teaching during his ministry. "Doctrine" is the rendering of the very word (שמועה) used by the prophet in ch. liii. 1, "Who hath believed our *report?*" Those who are to be taught are described as "weaned children," or simple and child-like disciples. But it is objected that the children are here described as weanlings, and not as sucklings; and that on this hypothesis, the weaning so particularly mentioned, would have no significancy. Surely the words of the Psalmist have been forgotten, "I have behaved and quieted myself as a child that is weaned of his mother: my soul is even as a weaned child." (Ps. cxxxi. 2.) "The point of comparison," says Hengstengberg, "between the soul and the weaned or small child (comp. Isa. xi. 8, xxviii. 9), is the unpretending humility. Exactly parallel is Matt. xviii. 3, 'Except ye be converted, and become as little children,' and ver. 4, 'Whoever, therefore, humbles himself as this little child.'" Christ himself said, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." (Matt. xi. 25.) See also John xii. 38, &c.

Digitized by Google

Ver. 10.—For (it is) rule upon rule, rule upon rule, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little.

We learn from ver. 13 that it was "the word of Jehovah" that was "rule upon rule," and the application seems clearly to be to the teaching of Christ. The language is probably borrowed from the building of a wall; the line being the horizontal line, shifted upwards from time to time, and the rule being the mason's rule. The gradual addition of materials is expressed by "here a little and there a little."

Ver. 11.—For with scorn-provoking lips and a strange tongue will he speak unto this people.

Scorn-provoking, although not a very eligible phrase, renders very closely the idea in the Hebrew, לַעֲגֵי. The root לעג in all its conjugations bears the meaning of "laughing to scorn," or "holding in derision." The verbal noun לַעַג has uniformly the same signification of "scorn" or "derision," and the other form לָעֵג (if it can be distinguished from לַעַג) is only used in Ps. xxxv. 16, besides in this text, and there it signifies "scorners." In Isaiah xxxiii. 19, the *part. Niph.* of the verb occurs. The obvious meaning would be "derided," or "mocked at," and so the margin of the authorized version reads "a people of a *ridiculous* tongue that thou canst not understand." There seems to be absolutely no authority at all for the rendering "stammering." The allusion is evidently to the fact that a foreign language provokes laughter among those who do not understand it. In the passage before us the parallelism of the two clauses requires that the word shall be understood as referring to a foreign language, and the rendering, therefore, ought to be the same as in Isa. xxxiii. 19. "Ridiculous" might be employed, but that it wants dignity. The LXX. render it *φαυλισμον χειλεων*, from *φαυλιζω* to despise. "A strange tongue," literally another tongue. This may be supposed to be a prediction of the manner of our Lord's teaching. When he was asked why he taught in parables, he answered, "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables, that seeing they may see and not perceive." (Mark iv. 11, 12.) But the Apostle Paul quotes this verse in 1 Cor. xiv. 21 in such a connexion as to suggest another application of the prophecy —"In the law it is written, With other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people, and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord." The words *εν ἑτερογλωσσοις και εν χειλεσιν ἑτεροις* will very well bear to be thus rendered,

Digitized by Google

and are a sufficiently close translation of the original Hebrew, provided we exclude the idea of "stammering," which has no warrant, as we have seen, in the Hebrew word. The Apostle draws from his quotation the conclusion, "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." Commentators have in general taken great pains to show that the Apostle merely cites Isaiah in the way of illustration, without implying that the matter which he was discussing had really any place in the prediction. They have adopted this course, because they could not see how this prophecy could have any reference to the Pentecostal gift of tongues. But they have not been very successful in showing the coherency of the Apostle's argument on this supposition; nor does there seem any difficulty in the way of supposing that this chapter really contains a prophecy of apostolic times. The *objects* of Christ's teaching have been mentioned—not the wise and prudent, but babes. The *method* of his teaching has been declared—Line upon line. The further promulgation of the same great truths is to be with "scorn-provoking lips, and a strange tongue." How strikingly was this fulfilled, when, on the very day of Pentecost, the Jews "mocking said, These men are full of new wine." And the Apostle Paul asks the Corinthians whether, if, when all were speaking with tongues, an unlearned or unbeliever should come in, he would not say that they were mad.

Ver. 12.—For he said to them, "This is the rest; cause the weary to rest, and this is the refreshing," but they would not hear.

This is the justification of God's method of procedure. He hid these things from the wise—he spake in parables—while the truths of the Gospel were giving life to the Gentiles, they became mere signs to the Jews, for he wrapped them up in a strange tongue—and all this because when he had spoken plainly to them of rest and refreshing, they would not hear. Exactly parallel is our Lord's own denunciation—"Ye have taken away the key of knowledge, so that ye neither enter in yourselves, nor suffer them that are entering to go in."

Ver. 13.—And the word of Jehovah was to them rule upon rule, rule upon rule, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little, that they might go on falling backward, and be broken and snared and taken.

The effect of the preaching of the Gospel upon the impenitent is now described. It would be a savour of death unto death, even as to them that believed, it would be a savour of life unto life. The verb הלך "to go," placed before another verb, often signifies continuance of its action, in which sense we have rendered it above. There is a remarkable parallelism

Digitized by Google

between this verse and Isa. viii. 15, which is worthy of fuller investigation. The subject is the same in both passages—the Gospel message of salvation through Christ. "Sanctify," says the prophet, "the Lord of hosts himself" (that is, the Messiah), "and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary" (to those who believe), "but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them" (those, namely, who refuse to hear) "shall *stumble and fall, and be broken, and snared, and taken.*"

That the reference is to the Messiah is proved by the fact that the 18th verse is quoted as the words of Messiah, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch. ii. 13), and Professor Alexander along with Henderson admits that vers. 17 and 18 are the words of Christ. This proves that the passage in ch. xxviii. so exactly parallel must also refer to Gospel times, and thereby establishes the correctness of our exposition of the foregoing context. Not that we mean to deny that it contained a warning for the time then present, and for the apostle's contemporaries, but the true and full application of it seems to be fixed down with almost absolute certainty to the days of the ministry of Christ and of his apostles.

Vers. 14, 15.—Therefore hear the word of Jehovah, ye scornful men, the rulers of this people which is in Jerusalem. Because ye have said, "We have made a covenant with death, and with hell we have formed a league; the overflowing scourge when it passes through shall not come upon us, for we have made falsehood our refuge, and in fraud have we hid ourselves."

Following the same principle of interpretation as in the preceding verses, we find here a description of the race of unbelieving Jews, to whom the glad tidings of the Gospel were first addressed. They were "scorners," for they scoffed at Christ, and at the gift of tongues. The prophet describes them as saying what their actions necessarily implied. The word חֹזֶה generally signifies a seer, but the context requires that it be rendered "league, or agreement." Alexander correctly observes, that the substitution of the cognate word חזות in the 18th verse precludes the idea of any error in the text, and he explains the change of meaning by tracing it to the idea of "an interview, or looking one another in the face."

Ver. 16.—Therefore, thus saith the Lord Jehovah, "Behold, I lay in Zion a stone, a stone of proof, a corner of preciousness, a founded foundation; he that believeth, will not be in haste."

Digitized by Google

"A stone of proof," may mean either, a stone which *has been tried*, or, a stone *which tries others*. The former meaning is that chosen by our translators; the latter one derives countenance from the parallel passage in chap. viii. 14, "He shall be for a stone of stumbling and rock of offence." The Apostle Peter also, after quoting this verse, evidently alludes to the first two clauses, where he says, "Unto you which believe he is precious, but unto the disobedient, a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence." The Jews tell us that the stone here spoken of was that one on which the Ark of the Covenant was placed in the Temple of Solomon; and that when the High Priest entered into the holy of holies, the place being dark, he had need to take care lest it might prove a stone of stumbling. Perhaps the idea may not be altogether without foundation. At all events, the Messiah is here represented as the true refuge in opposition to the refuges of lies, in which the obstinate Jews were trusting for deliverance.

Vers. 17, 18.—And I will set judgment for the line, and justice for the plummet: and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place. And your covenant with death shall be disannulled; and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, ye shall be for a down-treading.

The meaning of the figurative language employed in the first clause of ver. 17, is explained by 2 Kings xxi. 13, "I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria, and the plummet of the house of Ahab." That is, God would measure out to them the same doom which he had inflicted upon Israel. So here, the meaning is, that their punishment should be such as justice demanded. And the fulfilment took place when, after their rejection of Christ, the Romans came and took away both their place and their nation.

Ver. 19.—According to the fulness of its passing over shall it take you away; for morning by morning shall it pass over, by day and by night; and shall be removed only when they understand the teaching; *or, and there shall be nothing but removing till they understand the teaching.*

The long continuance of the judgment in the dispersion of Israel appears to be here indicated. The latter clause is obscure. In the Hebrew it stands thus, וְהָיָה רַק־זְוָעָה הָבִין שְׁמוּעָה. The word זועה occurs only here and in four other places in the *Khetib*, where the *Keri* reads זעוה. Both words appear to mean the same, and to be derived from זעה or זוע, "to remove." The words הבין שמועה are the same as are found in ver. 9, and are there translated, "Whom will he

make to understand doctrine:" *i. e.*, as we before observed, the doctrine of the Messiah. Consistency requires that the same signification should be given to them here; and thus they are parallel with the words of Christ himself, "Ye shall not see me henceforth until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Ver. 20.—For the bed is too short to stretch one's self, and the covering too narrow to wrap one's self.

This intimates their comfortless condition when they should find that all their refuges of lies had failed them.

Vers. 21, 22.—For the Lord shall rise up as in mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work; and bring to pass his act, his strange act. And now scoff not lest your bands be made strong, for I have heard from the Lord Jehovah of Hosts a consumption and a decree against the whole earth.

This conclusion of the whole prophecy appears to look forward to an event more distant than the dispersion of Israel by the Romans. When David was first raised to the throne of Judah, the Philistines having heard of his being anointed, came up to seek him. Twice they "spread themselves in the valley of Rephaim," and twice were they overcome by a miraculous interposition. On the first occasion so complete was their overthrow, that it could be likened to nothing but an inundation of waters which have burst their dykes: and David said, "God hath broken in upon mine enemies by mine hand like the breaking forth of waters: therefore they called the name of the place Beral-perazim, or, "the place of breaches." On the second occasion we are told that they "smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon, even to Gazer." (2 Sam. v. 17—25; 1 Chron. xiv. 8—17.) The reference made by Isaiah to *Mount Perazim* and to *Gibeon* may refer therefore entirely to this victory of David. Or the allusion in the case of Gibeon may be to the slaughter of the five kings of the Amorites (Josh. x. 5—14), when "the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them," and the sun stood still upon Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon. Of the future event which is likened to these victories, Isaiah declares that it is a consumption or full end (כָּלָה) decreed against the *whole* earth;—language which seems to point to the last interposition of the Almighty previous to the establishment of his kingdom. So that, just as the Amorites strove to hinder the settlement of Israel in the land of promise, and as the Philistines endeavoured to prevent David's *ascension* to the throne of Judah, we may

Digitized by Google

expect that a mighty confederacy shall arise to oppose the Messiah when the time approaches for Him to sit as God's King upon his holy hill of Zion. To this future confederacy the Prophet refers, and the warning which he addresses to Israel appears to be that they should beware lest the door of repentance should be for ever shut against them. They had hitherto resisted God, and had brought chastisement after chastisement upon themselves. Their city would become a heap of ruins, they would themselves be scattered unto the four corners of the earth. At length the day of God's vengeance would come, when the kings of the earth, and the rulers, and all that had counsel against his Anointed would feel the weight of his indignation. Let them take heed that they did not continue to scoff, lest their bands should be made strong; or, in the parallel language of the Second Psalm, "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little."

Art. IV.—IS ROME BABYLON, AND WHY?

There can be little doubt that many of the excellent of the earth are deterred from study of the prophetic Scriptures by the difference of opinion which exists as to their import. They see men like Mr. Elliott and the Bishop of Cashel, equally spiritual, controvert each other's statements, and infer that one or other must be wholly wrong! Would it not be wiser to suppose that each of these contending parties may be right in the main as to what he affirms, but wrong as to what he overlooks?—that the difference between them arises from their selecting opposite points of view?—that the field of prophecy is too large for examination from a single point, and that a third might possibly be taken up which would enable us to reconcile both?

Instead of disputing between ourselves, let us first seek how we may agree, and search the cause which has led to such diversity of opinions.

May there not, as suggested by the late Hugh White, be some great and startling fact omitted in all our schemes, or have we accepted as true, and reasoned from, any facts in past history which had really no existence, or have been distorted by Romanist ingenuity? Are we right in excluding the Greek Apostasy, numbering as it does far more *zealous*

Digitized by Google

adherents than the Roman, from *all* mention in Scripture? Have we any ground for maintaining that America, Germany, Russia, and Scandinavia are excluded on the one hand, or Persia, India, and the Eastern world on the other, from all share in unfulfilled prophecy? Had the Hussites, the Nestorians, or the early Armenians nothing to do with Scripture?

Instead of confining ourselves to Edward Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," would it not be wiser to take the Bible for our compass, and universal history for our map, not adapting, like Rollin and many others, the compass to the map, but rectifying the map by the unerring compass? Were we laying theories aside for a moment, to examine the foundation of those theories, we might possibly discover the existence of an overlooked error, causing one class of commentators to diverge unconsciously to the right, the other to the left, yet throwing both considerably out of the direct track.

There are two great questions, upon our answer to which depends the correctness of our interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy:

1st. Is the Church of Rome the Mystery of Iniquity, and the City of Rome the Babylon of the Apocalypse?

2nd. Is the Pope *the* Antichrist?

These two are wholly distinct, and the admission of the former does not involve the latter as a thing of course, although they are often treated as forming parts of the same proposition.

According to Archdeacon Digby, either Rome is Babylon, and the Pope the Antichrist, or neither Rome nor the Pope are mentioned in Scripture at all!

According to Dr. Newman,* on the other hand, the question between Popery and Protestantism, falls within the simple formula, "Rome is either the pillar and ground of the truth, or she is Antichrist? In proportion as they revolt from receiving her as the latter, they are compelled to receive her as the former!"

Mr. Newton, on the other hand, stoutly maintains that Babylon does not signify Rome, but the literal City of that name in the land of Shinar, which is again to be rebuilt; and that the *Antichrist is a yet future King of Rome.*

Are we shut up to any of these conclusions?

Instead of making assertions, let us investigate one fact.

* Newman on Developments, p. 73.

Digitized by Google

Were we to prove the Church of Rome as literally and truly the daughter of the Babylonian Apostasy, as the American Episcopal Church is the daughter of the Church of England; if the connexion between the old Assyrians and the modern Roman people prove as close as that between the New Englanders and the old English, we should have some definite and fixed grounds to proceed upon.

Establish the identity of the Roman worship in all respects with that of Astarte, and that the Pontiff himself is not the successor of Peter, but the representative of Nimrod, Nebuchadnezzar, and Nero, and you at once destroy any claim for reverence he may have made upon the mind of the most credulous of our countrymen.

It will probably be asked, what evidence have we on the points thus raised? That evidence given at length would fill volumes. Ten years ago, it was incomplete. The recent discoveries of Layard and Rawlinson in Assyria; of Wilkinson, in Egypt, the chronological researches of the Duke of Manchester, Mr. Bosanquet, and Sir William Jones, the archæological studies of Huggins and the Honorable William Herbert, the ethnological facts collected by Knox, Latham, Morton, Smith, and Hamilton, with the admissions of Continental Infidels and the leaders of the Secret Societies formed against our faith; the mystic, magnetic, and magical delusions which have from time to time existed, and which are now carried on so openly by Baron Dupotet, Cahuguet, and others in Paris, and even here, must all be carefully analyzed. Suffer me, however, to present the practical upshot of my own studies in a short and concentrated form.

In the sixth century after the Flood, Egypt and Asia were overrun by the armies of an Assyrian Queen, named by the Assyrians Astarte, or Athor; by the Babylonians Mylitta; by the Greeks Pallas, Hera, or Aphrodite, as they respectively belonged to the Dorian, Hellenic, or Ionian clans; by the Egyptians Isis, and by the Persians Shimar, or Semiramis.* Her armies were commanded by a son, named in various dialects, Horus, Apollo, or Assarac, Adonis, Thammuz, Hercules, or Nimrod, whom tradition reputes to have been slain by a red-haired chief, who refused to submit to him. Her husband was called Osiris.

By this Queen the Chaldee mysteries were formed for the purpose of organizing a distinct class, drawn from all races,

* Manetho Eratosthenes, quoted in Wilkinson's Antiquities, p. 37; Rawlinson's Commentary, p. 67; Epiphanius quoted Nimrod, p. 54; Cory's Fragments, p. 18; Plin. Nat. Hist. p. 30 to 57; Apollonius.

Digitized by Google

deprived of all individual nationality, and devoted only to her.* This Priesthood was governed by a Pontiff appointed by the Sovereign, supported by a College believed to consist of seventy-two hierophants,† and was divided into seven orders similar to those of the Romish Church, the four higher taking the vow of celibacy, the lower corresponding to the Readers, exorcists, &c., of the Roman Catholics, being allowed to marry. Their costume, as retained by the Etruscan branch, who were, in part at least, so far as the priests and nobles were concerned, an early Chaldean colony,‡ precisely corresponded to the modern Romanist. The mitre, crozier, stole, alb, chasuble, cope, were their distinctive badges, whilst the Archflamens bore the episcopal ring. Admission into the lower ranks of the priesthood could be conferred only by the higher, and by *χειροτονια*, imposition of hands, and breathing of the Archflamen upon the Hiereus, and to those not only initiated into the lesser, but the higher mysteries, was granted the privilege of studying architecture, astrology, chemistry, geometry, mathematics or medicine, and mesmerism or magic; all the initiated being sworn never to disclose their knowledge to any one not duly enrolled. Thus all power was confined to a class, who, precluded from marriage, could have no sympathy with the people, and would become the ready tools of their Queen.

These priests, I believe it will be admitted, had three grades of instruction, one for the low castes, as they were called, or in other words for the conquered fraternity of Phut, Canaan, and Mizram; another for the military caste, and a third kept to themselves; but as to the first, differing in every country, and adapted to the feelings of the populace whom they deceived. Of that populace a number, too, were made sacred persons, enrolled as friars, but not admitted to the priesthood.

This Assyrian queen, there is reason to believe, pretended to be, or at all events was, worshipped by the priesthood she instituted, as an incarnation of the Holy Spirit of God, and as the organ of grace and mercy, as the Bride of the Eternal Father, the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head. Whilst her murdered son was passed off as the deliverer, the Son of God, and whose heel the serpent bruised, his mother surviving, retained the power he had won over the nations.

That her son was the Nimrod of Scripture would require a

* Eusebe Salverte, p. 300.

† Vide Godfrey Higgins, Anacalypsis, *passim*.

‡ Mrs. H. Grey, and Col. Hamilton Smith.

Digitized by Google

dissertation to prove; but is, I think, more than probable. We find, then, after his death, that the Deities worshipped in Assyria were,—

First, Ham and Seba, subaltern deities,* but objects of divine manifestation, and, in fact, gods and intercessors with the triune Divinity. That Divinity was supposed to consist of,—the Eternal Father, Shemir, the incarnate female principle; and Assarac, the false Messiah, her son,—these two last only being objects of much worship, as assuming a mortal frame, the supreme Father interfering little with mortal affairs.

The Oriental apostasy speedily broke into three parts. The greater mysteries reserved for the priesthood, the lesser for the soldiers and nobles, remained nearly the same everywhere, the vulgar faith being modified for political purposes; and the Egyptian priesthood on the separation from Assyria, and expulsion of their conquerors, seizing the right to marry, and thereby constituting themselves, like the Brahmins, an aristocracy as well as a priesthood.

The first step in the lesser system was that of *Baptismal Regeneration.*† No person was to learn aught of doctrine or discipline till regenerated by the priest, plunged under water, and raised from it half drowned. The priest made him pronounce a formula, renouncing his nationality, devoting himself to the queen of heaven; and then marked his forehead in a mixture of salt, saliva, and water with the mystic Tau, the sign of the false Messiah; he was then pronounced διφυες, twice born, regenerate. He was no longer a Chaldean, Babylonian, or Arab, or descended out of Shem, Ham, or Japheth, but the member of a mystic brotherhood, to whom alone was allowed the privilege of eternal life. Yet this brotherhood was in practice confined to white and high caste men. Fraternity might be talked of—it was simply the object of its leaders to form an association for their own ends. The candidate was then placed under a private instructor, to whom he confessed from time to time every thought. When pronounced worthy he was admitted to the interior mysteries of the goddess. There, after being sprinkled with holy water, a *wafer*, called mola, the same name now applied by the Italians to the wafer in the Mass, was presented by the hierophant, which he ate in honour of the queen of heaven, and at the same time swore to be faithful to her. A cross, the mystic Tau, was wor-

* Vide "Rawlinson's Commentaries."

† Vide Nimrod, 320; Tertullian; Apuleius; Pliny; Oliver's "History of Masonry."

Digitized by Google

shipped; the same genuflexions as now performed, whilst the tonsured priest appeared in the same costume as that the priest now wears. Then strange scenes followed, and phantasmogorical illusions and mesmeric influence; and amidst burning incense and the shouts of worshippers, the goddess was seen revealed amidst her half intoxicated votaries, ascending from her heavenly palace, and revealed in dazzling light; and declared that all worship, whether directed to Astarte, Hera, Aphrodite, Pallas, Ceres, Diana, Proserpine, or Shinar, were alike received to the one Isis, the incarnate manifestation of the Spirit of God; and that those who once became her followers, delivered at death from the bondage of matter, should dwell for ever as disembodied spirits; whilst the profane vulgar should pass from body to body, unable to raise themselves to her. Penance followed disobedience of the confessor,—scourging, self-macerations were recommended, but not enforced. The initiated were required, as a proof of their loyalty, to keep three annual feasts in honour of the Virgin Goddess,—the feast of her birth, on the 25th of March, or Lady-day; the feast of her son's birth, on the 25th of December; and the feast of her assumption into heaven and reunion with the Deity on the 8th of September; and also a fast of forty days, followed by a feast day, agreeing with modern Easter in date, and preceded by a Carnival. Was not the attempt to substitute this for the Hebrew passover the cause of those dreadful wars which separated the Church of Wales from the proselytes of Augustine? Were not thousands of Britons slaughtered rather than accept the Pagan fast for the Christian feast? On the other hand, the greater mysteries seem to have been confined to few, and these again were divided into two parts.

There were what they called the right hand and the left hand mysteries. In the former the virgin still continued the main object of worship, and she was represented, we have seen, as the incarnate spirit of Jehovah. In the other, which was confined to the descendants of Ham, the initiated were taught however that Jehovah, the Creator of the world, was a stern and a cruel Deity, hating human knowledge and happiness;* but that the prince of the power of the air, Satan, the true God, taking compassion on mankind, had sent his son, Boodh, Assarac, or Nimrod, or Ham, for man's salvation from the yoke of Jehovah, and that he would deliver those who worshipped him from the bondage of the body in which

* This creed is still held in Koordistan by the Sabæans, or Christians as they call themselves, of St. John the Baptist, and may be traced in their Scriptures. They date back, however, to an unrecorded period.

Digitized by Google

man's spirit had been imprisoned by Jehovah, the Creator of the world, and the God of the Jews; Jehovah had cut off Assarac, but he would again become incarnate for final victory, and raise them to dwell with him in disembodied happiness. Thus, then, the resurrection of the body was directly denied, and rejected as a calumny. All things were lawful to those who worshipped him. They might worship Jehovah if they would but worship him too. There were the students of magic, the searchers of forbidden knowledge, the sorcerers, the wizards, the devil worshippers.

If the followers of the right hand mystery subsist in the Jesuit order, I have had personal evidence that the left hand mysteries still exist in continental Europe. The followers of both sects might however, then, as now, be mixed up together. I have been assured that there are many priests at this moment in France who are also Rosicrucians, and still more who are Templars.

The knowledge of magic, of mesmerism, of medicine, of gunpowder, was not to be lightly given away. To become also first-rate mesmerists, or magicians, we all know requires strict fasting and continence, and the more a person can disengage himself from what is merely sensual, the more he can act upon others.*

Nor was this worship unrewarded. These men were expert chemists and able magicians. By the fumes of drugs burnt as incense, they could wrap the spirit in delight, and throw the body into a state of coma, in which mesmeric clairvoyance might easily be induced, and the party believe himself to converse with the invisible world.† By the Stone of Memphis they could render their votaries insensible to pain, as by chloroform. By hasheesh they could wrap them in ravishing enjoyment almost beyond human power to support, unfitting them for the duties of life for ever afterwards. These they used, but as secrets of their power; but the destruction of the Gauls, and many other facts, prove that they had also means of destruction more fearful than any we know now. Need we refer to the Greek fire, far more formidable than our Congreve rockets now.

The apostasy thus commenced in worship of a female deliverer, broke speedily into three schisms, corresponding with the three great races of mankind, and called by the

* Vide Salvertes' able, but unhappily Infidel, "Dissertation on Ancient Magic."

† All these experiments are performed every Sunday in Paris by parties who avow that they derive their science and their religion from the ancient mysteries.

Apostle Paul, for distinction, the Greek or Hellenic, comprising the whole of the dark-eyed white-complexioned race, the Scythian comprehending the Northern, and the Berber extending through Eastern Asia, Africa, India, and everywhere amongst the race of Ham.

These three seem at first to have had their chief seats at Babel, at Thibet, and at Memphis, each having its own Pontiff, and pretending to be the true Church. Although Nineveh was the capital of Asia, it is worthy of remark that the college of priests preferred fixing at Babel away from the overpowering influence of the military court.

The apostasy that took place in Thibet still continues unaltered. There we find that the first step to salvation is absolute regeneration by baptism, that heaven can only be reached by holy monks and meek-eyed nuns, who have renounced marriage, and who duly scourge themselves, or each other; all married persons passing through purgatory; that self-maceration is meritorious before the Deity; saints and crosses are everywhere stuck up; that chants, almost Gregorian, are constantly performed in the temples; that the sole intercession with him is his once incarnate Virgin Queen, his son Buddha, or Nimrod *, who is always represented as a Zambo or son of an African father and white mother, or else as entirely black amongst races by whom a Zambo or Negro can never have been seen; being raised above all mortal care, and returning to earth only, for destruction of the material universe; that the costume of the monks and nuns is identical with that of modern Rome; that they practise confession, sprinkle holy water, cross themselves on all occasions, set up crosses, kneel before the Madonna and child, in figure exactly Roman, distribute the wafer, repeat prayers similar to the Romanist on the same rosaries of which they claim the invention; and, in short, according to the testimony of the Jesuits, differ from Rome only in two unhappy particulars, the reverencing the Grand Lama for their Pope, and the appellation of Buddha, as given to their Incarnate male Deity. It is needless to say that of atonement, or justification, or renewal of heart, or salvation from sin, these men know and desire nothing. Furthermore, the Roman Catholic views of heaven and hell, and purgatory, of the merit of good works, of the use of forms, of the singing of masses and prayers for the dead, are perfect transcripts of those of Thibet, the very costume and regulations of their monks and friars; and is there not reason to believe physiologically that these Tartars

* Vide Fathers Grueber, D'Orville, confirmed by M. Turner and M. Davis.

Digitized by Google

descend from a mixed race of soldiers, partly consisting of descendants of Cush, and partly from apostate children of Japheth, who assisted Horus, Assarac, or Nimrod, in his attempt to subdue the north. And does not this agree with the Assyrian and Persian record, that Semiramis marched upon Tartary, and made Balk the seat of her power. And does not this explain the warrior descendants of Japheth, who settled in Tartary, choosing to have their own priests, not those from Babylon, whilst the King of Egypt, on recovering independence, was equally anxious to keep his priesthood national.

Into the Helleun and Barber creeds I cannot spare space to enter, as it would be going much over the same ground. Suffice it to observe, however, that this apostasy of virgin worship never seems to have infected the fierce and warrior tribes of the North, who, pouring down from the Caucasus, destroyed Nineveh in B.C. 560, and seizing on Bâbylon in B.C. 538, made it the capital of their empire. The Chaldeans, finding their creed at first patronized but ultimately rejected by their conquerors, rebelled, and set up as a king one of their own number, Smerdis the magi, but who pretended to be and passed himself off as legitimate heir of the last great Northern-King: he was slain by a Perso-Median revolt. The Bâbylonians again rebelled during their new king's absence, and set up a man of Babylon. Their city was taken and its king slain. They again revolted, their city was taken and sacked, and the people slaughtered by Xerxes, B.C. 487, and the conqueror then removed his residence to Shushan or Sura in Persia.

The defeated virgin-worshippers rallied upon the Greek cities in Asia Minor, making Pergamos their centre.* Here they removed the palladium of Babylon, the cubic stone, the image of the Idæan goddess (the mother of the gods) called Cybele, perhaps to elude Persian wrath. Here, protected by the municipalities which, as in modern Turkey up to 1821, were independent of state control, they carried on their worship in secret. Here they caballed with the Greeks and brought forward Alexander at last as a re-incarnation of Nimrod, or the true Messiah. Chaldean craft had more than Grecian gallantry to do with Persian overthrow, and with the defeat of those who, in much darkness, and with many errors, still had some glimmerings of the one true God. Nor were the Egyptian priests less criminal. They, too, accepted the conqueror as an incarnation of their God.

* Vide for authorities, Col. Chesney, vol. ii., p. 185.

Digitized by Google

The death of Alexander defeated the schemes of the Chaldeans, and preserved the Hebrews from appointed massacre; and the Persian empire recovering its independence not long after his death, drove the Chaldee priests and Greek soldiers into Asia Minor, where they fully established themselves, but combined with the Ionian party against the Dorians of * Sparta and Macedon, and caballed at length with the Romans for support. † Accordingly we find Scipio, in preparing for the Greek war, moving that the senate of Rome should, in lieu of its old divinities, place itself under the protection of the Idæan goddess; that this was agreed to; that Scipio, with a number of conscript fathers, was sent; that the priests agreed; that a voice appearing to proceed from the image expressed its readiness to remove to Rome; and that it was accordingly installed in the capitol, as the secret and tutelar divinity; that an Act was passed organizing and incorporating an order of monks, and another of mendicant friars, the only beggars allowed by law in Rome, and also forming a secret lay brotherhood in her honour, in which a vast number of the aristocracy inrolled themselves, and of which Scipio, Sylla, and Julius Cæsar successively became chiefs; but from which the vulgar were as rigidly excluded as from the Greek mysteries of Eleusis. Almost at the same time the Romans obtained admission to the Eleusinian or lesser mysteries, till then closed to them as foreigners. The organization thus carried on was ultimately supported by the Egyptian and Chaldean priesthood throughout the empire. By them Cæsar was put forward as born in no human mode, the Son of God. ‡ As such, he and his mother, Venus, Aphrodite, or Astarte were jointly worshipped, and their joint images, set up in the temples dedicated to him; and that he was preparing to march on Persia, to restore the Chaldees, when his career was cut short by murder. He first celebrated his entrance upon the office by that fearful sacrifice of one hundred nobles, one hundred knights and citizens, which only one before him had been able to perform, thus ratifying his inauguration as High Priest of Satan with human blood.

From the very first emigration of the Etrurians into Italy, they had brought with them a religion and mysteries corresponding with the Chaldee, and had set up a Pontiff, or Pontifex Maximus or Pope, as head of their priesthood, who was with them; a noble, inviolate and above all law, who by

* The Dorians always clung to the worship of the male principle, the false Messiah, or war god.

† Liv. xxxix. 4. ‡ Vide Nimrod, iii. 468.

Digitized by Google

his fiat could forbid the presenting any measure to the people, or carrying out any election as displeasing to the Deity, and had the power of excluding any individual from the rights of the citizenship. He was the head of the priesthood, possessing over *them* the power of life and death. From the time of Numa the Romans had accepted this Pontiff as their civil chief. He was called King of the Ages. He could neither by Senate or people, be called to account. His royal costume is still worn on all state occasions by the reigning Pope. Before the one as before the other is always borne the mystic fan, the badge of Bacchus, of Nimrod, and of Boodh. On his mitre was engraved as on that of Mastai Ferretti, now the name of his God, χρησ,* the Greek mystic appellation for Buddha, or Horns of the Mystery. His rights and his powers were precisely the same as those of the Pope, save that they extended only to the citizens of Rome, and he claimed no power over any but those who sought to share in Roman privileges. Still he had been hitherto a separatist from the old Chaldean priesthood. The ecclesiastical validity of his appointment might be doubtful. Julius Cæsar, however, becoming heir to all the rights and powers of Attalus, the Pontiff King of Pergamos, became Head of the Oriental priesthood. Did he, by accepting the Pontificate of Rome, combine the two? Was he supported in this by the Etruscans, forming two-thirds at least of the Roman people, and by all the Orientals? Was it as Pontiff, rather than as Emperor, that Cæsar differed from preceding generals and kings? Was he thus a sacred person, a direct representative of the Deity, a person above all human law? Was he the first in whom the powers of Pontiff and Imperator had ever been combined? Was it as *King of the Ages*, that he changed the calendar, and reformed the law, as Gregory since.

Antony, on the murder of Cæsar, attempted by aid of the Egyptian priesthood, to perform the same part; and Octavius, therefore, was compelled, whilst appropriating to himself the rank of Pontiff, to fall back upon the Roman nationality, and the old polytheutic creed.

Tiberius, however, lent himself to the influence of the Chaldean Magi. Under his influence they governed Rome. Then were introduced the lamps burning in mid-day, the long processions with lighted tapers, the mysterious incense of the old Chaldees. The higher classes on one side were

* The distinction between χρησ, the name of Boodh signifying the "mild one," and Christ "the anointed," should be most carefully marked.

Digitized by Google

led by the mysteries of Chaldea, the lower by those of Isis. The Egyptian priesthood, after the union of Egypt with Rome, flocking to the capital, differing not more than the Dominicans and Franciscans now. The middle classes, however, inclined to remain attached to their old national form as a bond of union, whilst practically doubting its truth, and only restrained from throwing it off altogether, by national vanity.

Nero followed, and became a proselyte of the higher, and ultimately of the left hand mysteries, the direct worship of Satan. Can we wonder that the aspirant to these horrible rites, which none could enter save by murder, real or pretended, of a human victim, sought to destroy the enemies of that Prince of Darkness whom he knowingly worshipped? Was it not to screen his own partisans from the hands of the people, that he directed against the people of Christ the wrath of the populace, and saved the followers of Isis and of Mithra and of Astarte, from that exposure of their awful rites, which might have sooner proved fatal to him.

After a time, however, the Chaldeans became alarmed at the general prejudice excited against all Orientals; and the Egpytian priesthood in particular, astonished at the miracles, and surprised at the martyrdom of the Apostles, became half persuaded that the Christians were even higher magicians than themselves, and although not converted, believed. According to Adrian, real faith in Egypt—there was none. The Christian Bishops, in secret, joined in the mysteries of Serapis, whilst the priests of Serapis admitted the incarnation of Christ.

For long previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, in the revolt of Bar Cochab, there grew up in the deserts of Engaddi and Nitria two vast communities*—one the Essenes, the other the Therapeutæ; both deep students in magic, having all things in common under control of their chiefs, abstaining from marriage; but there is reason to suspect, not unconscious of the gratification which can be obtained from opium, sherbeesh, hyosogamus, and bella donna, and other forbidden things. These men devoted their whole time to that contemplative quiet without which these drugs lose their power. They were great mesmerists and miracle workers. They had regular grades of initiation, corresponding with modern Freemasonry. They had a College at Mount Carmel, founded by the Chaldeans, settled in Palestine by Shalmanezer. The worship of the Virgin there was carried on in the same way,

* Neander, p. 430; Beausobre, p. 567.

Digitized by Google

as it is by the monks of Mount Carmel now. In the second century a man named Basilides * became the high priest of this brotherhood. He had previously been initiated in the higher Chaldean mysteries. He was a man of vast attainments, and especially in that magical and mesmeric knowledge which enabled him to work false miracles, and to impose on men's minds. Scorning the control of Rome, he formed a scheme for uniting all the Oriental sects, Jew, Christian, Essene, Chaldean, in one common alliance against the Roman proselytism, allowing each to retain his own belief, yet framing a common formula in which all might join. To effect this, he pretended to possess a secret revelation, handed down direct from *St. Peter*, and also in some degree from Mathias. He taught that Holy Scripture had a twofold meaning, like the works of Homer, one literal, for carnal men—one spiritual, known only to those to whom it had been handed down, as to him, direct from the Apostles, and reserved for the verbal teaching of those who should be found worthy. Thus, then, it became easy for him to adapt the Gospel to the views of the Chaldean, and whilst perhaps preaching it in its purity, where by so doing he could deceive, privately to neutralize its purport, and to lead men into his toils. In fact, he played the same part as certain Jesuits did, who in the seventeenth century pretended to be Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents, in order to disseminate their own views without suspicion. Are there no such men amongst us now?

Here, for the present, I must stop, for here I conscientiously believe begins the turning point in the history of that great apostasy which was soon to swallow up the Christian Church through Asia and half Europe, and which, from the secret religion of the higher, became now the avowed creed of the humble classes as well. Of this, Basilides and Ammonius Saccas were the first promoters; Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, and Gregory the Great, the successful chiefs.

* From Suetonius we find that the followers of Simon Magus, or Chreestians, were often confounded by the Romans with the disciples of our Lord, and that the crimes of the one were imputed to the guilty members of the other.

Digitized by Google

Notes on Scripture.

THE GRACIOUS DESIGN.

"That He might humble thee."—DEUT. VIII. 16.

THUS did Jehovah address the children of Israel at the close of their eventful and protracted pilgrimage in the wilderness. Forty years had their weary feet trodden its barren sands, and if the inquiry arose, "Why are we kept so long under discipline and training?" the answer was, "*To humble thee.*" How necessary is humility for our well-being —how valuable in the sight of God—how difficult of attainment! Fallen man, and even renewed man, is slow to learn this great lesson of humility.

It may be a profitable employment, at the close of one year and the commencement of another, to review the dealings of God with us in the light of the design of God respecting us. May it lead us earnestly to long that his own gracious intentions may be accomplished!

The apostle informs us that the things which happened to Israel in the wilderness "were for an ensample or type; and were written for our admonition." We who are the followers of the Lamb are journeying over a desert world, and are professedly seeking "a better country." We are overlooked and cared for by Him "who guided them in the wilderness like a flock." If we have not daily miracles to call forth our wonder, we have daily mercies to awaken gratitude. God hath not forsaken the earth, nor is he unmindful of his people who are scattered over it. His ever wakeful and Almighty providence attends us, his angel guards are around us, he himself is everywhere present, and evermore waking; and it is true wisdom to learn to trace his hand, and behold his greatness as written out in our history. This will tend to humble us by causing us to see our insignificance in the light of his greatness, and to contrast our unworthiness with his constant goodness.

But the Israelites beheld the judgments of God as well as his mercies, and were the subjects of his wise chastenings as well as of his watchful care. They saw many around them "consumed by his anger," and others "troubled by his wrath." And who can look back upon "the days that are past," without seeing that "the Lord is terrible in his doings towards the children of men." Alas! few see his hand, or humble themselves under it. Gaunt famine, consuming pestilence, and desolating wars, are the ministers of his indignation; and he smites not, unless there is a cause. If he "breaks the staff of bread in the land," it is because of the transgression of the people (Ezek. xiv. 13); and the pestilence is his awful protest against abounding sins. If men will not humble themselves during the pauses of his anger, while patience waits and mercy pleads, he will strike again, and still more severely; and at last, when all other means fail, "he will come out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity;" and then, if not before, "the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of man shall be made low, and the Lord alone shall be

Digitized by Google

exalted in that day." Blessed are those who now "sigh and cry for the abominations done in the land," whose "souls weep in secret places for the pride of others;" such shall prove that "when the Lord maketh inquisition for blood," he "forgetteth not the cry of the humble." Moses and Joshua mourned and wept over the nation's sins; and God graciously owned and greatly honoured them.

But the circumstance by which, above all others, the Lord intended to teach Israel humility, was their daily dependence on him for daily bread,—"who fed thee in the wilderness with manna, which thy fathers knew not, *that he might humble thee.*" They were thus taught their absolute helplessness, and that they were constant pensioners upon God's bounty. When man goes forth to his labour in the fields, breaks up the fallow ground, casts in the seed, and sees as the result of his toil a plentiful harvest springing up, he had need to be warned against pride and self-dependance. There is a danger of his saying, "My might and the power of my hand hath gotten me this wealth;" but surely all reason for self-glorying is taken out of the way, when the bread comes down ready prepared from heaven. This taught the receiver to give God the glory of all which had been received, and to exercise dependance upon him for the future; and this was humility. The manna, which was so miraculously provided, and so liberally bestowed, was typical of Christ, "the true bread from heaven." Nothing so fills the soul with true humility as a simple and thankful reception of Christ, the unspeakable gift of God. It is only when Christ is seen to be ALL, that the sinner feels his own nothingness. In him God has treasured up all blessings, that he might secure to himself all the glory. He makes Christ to be "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; that he who glorieth, may glory in the Lord." He who has really come to Christ, and received righteousness, will look alone to him for strength and wisdom. His whole walk will be one of renouncement of self, and reliance on the Saviour. He walks *with God*, being reconciled by the death of his Son; he walks *humbly*, crying out at every step, "Hold thou me up," "for thy name sake lead me and guide me."

While thus walking in dependance upon Christ, nourished by him, the living bread, for which we neither toiled nor laboured, we shall see daily more and more of his glories, and this will tend to lay the soul still lower in humility. Those who see Jesus as he is, are perfectly humble, and those who see him as revealed in the Gospel, and daily study his excellences, will increase in that excellent grace. The once self-glorifying tongue will be silent, or only employed in extolling him; and to depend on him for everything will become more the habit of the soul. Reason will no more proudly sit in judgment on the sayings or doings of him who is now seen to be infinitely wise and good, but the soul will sing, "He hath done whatsoever pleaseth him;" and whatever pleaseth Him is pleasing to me also.

The language of the humble heart will be, "I was most insignificant as a creature, and most vile as a sinner; and at the same time an imitator of Satan in pride and daring; but mercy, at an infinite

Digitized by Google

expense, and omnipotence, by a display of its noblest energies, hath saved and sanctified me; and all this hath God done that he might humble me; and, having humbled me, heap fresh favours and honours upon me." How wondrous is the power, how beautiful the process, how excellent the product! Divine love worketh reconciliation; reconciliation worketh penitence; penitence worketh gratitude; gratitude worketh humility; and humility loses all consciousness of its own existence as it bends adoringly before the Father of lights, "from whom cometh every good and perfect gift;" and sings, as it veils its face amidst the blaze of his glory, "All things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee."

In the coming kingdom, this feeling will perfectly pervade every one "accounted worthy to obtain that world." The whole family in heaven and earth will be perfectly humble and perfectly happy, for "God shall be all in all," and the creature shall know his place as a humble recipient of his bounty, and a grateful adorer at his feet. Let the new year find us clinging to the Cross, clothed with humility, and more than ever concerned "to learn of Him who was meek and lowly in heart," and to love him who first loved us, and gave himself for us, that we might be a people to show forth Jehovah's praise.

NOTES ON THE PSALMS.

Psalm XXXIX.

Here is surely one whom we might call "*Gershom*," for he is a stranger in a strange land. He is the same speaker (whoever that was) as in the previous psalm; for, if the one psalm spoke thus, "*I said, I am ready to halt*" (ver. 16), this begins "*I said, I will take heed to my ways*," and if the one spoke of being "*dumb with silence*" (ver. 14), not less does this, ver. 2, "I was dumb with silence."

The title does not tell us more than that there was a musical chorus of which, perhaps, "*Jeduthun*" may have been the name of the presiding singer, to whose care it was committed. But a glance at the contents shows a pilgrim-spirit, one journeying through a world of vanity, and praying at every step to be taught and kept in the will of God. Christ, when "learning obedience" and identifying himself with us (as in ver. 12), could use it, supplicating his Father in ver. 4; sympathising with our feeble frame in ver. 5; pronouncing the sentence of "Vanity and Vexation" on all that this world presents, however good and fair to the eye (ver. 6), and in ver. 7 turning towards *Jehovah*, as the only source of bliss. In ver. 9, 10, not only can every believer find his own experience, or what should be his experience under trial, but the Lord Jesus, also, could have used these words: "Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight," praying at the same time, "If it be possible, let this cup pass." The marred countenance of the Son of man, in which nothing of the "King in his beauty" could be seen, may be described in the words of ver. 11. But inter-

Digitized by Google

mixed with all the Pilgrim's melancholy laments, do we not recognise his hope and expectation of something better to come? Is not that "*the vanity*" of ver. 6, like that of Romans viii. 20, for it is followed up by ver. 7, "*My hope is in thee.*" There is "*Hope*" for this world! its "*vanity*" may give place to reality of bliss. An Israelite, amid Canaan's plenty, could feel this, as 1 Chron. xxix. 15 shows, and as Levit. xxv. 33 had taught them to feel." Then, even as now, the Psalmist could describe *Christ* when on earth, and every one of his family while passing through this earth to the kingdom, as

The Righteous One, a Pilgrim, and a Stranger.

Psalm XL.

Here is one who cries, "Lo! I come to do thy will, O God." We cannot fail to recognise Messiah here, even if we had not had the aid of the writer of Hebrews x. 5—10. The iniquities he speaks of in ver. 12 are *all ours** imputed to Him. He might say,

"And I'm a sinner in thy sight,
Although I never sinned."

Christ speaks throughout, so exclusively indeed, that the believer must here take up the words, not as his own experience (except where he can follow Christ to gather the spoil), but as the experience of the Captain of Salvation, in fighting that battle which has ended in everlasting triumph. It is only by accommodation that even ver. 1—3 can be used by the believer in describing his own case.

Read ver. 4, and meditate on what He who is the Word suggests —*God's thoughts toward us!* The unnumbered multitude of his thoughts of love to us! The forests with their countless leaves, the grass on every plain and mountain of earth, with its numberless blades, the sands on every shore of every river and ocean, the waves of every sea and the drops of every wave of every sea, the stars of heaven— none of these, nor all combined, could afford an adequate idea of the "*multitude* of his mercies," "*his wonderful* works,"—"*his thoughts toward us!*" And the *depth of love* in every one of these thoughts! Who can sit down, and meditate on Redemption's wonders? Who would not be confounded?

Now the whole Psalm has this theme. From ver. 1 to 3, we have a summary of God's dealings toward the Saviour, ending in the gathering of multitudes to Him *as the Shiloh.* Ver. 4 and 5, contain adoration of the purposes of God; and from ver. 9, to the end, we are made to witness something of the style in which these glorious purposes were carried on to fulfilment, in the actual coming and suffering of the Saviour. See Him *obeying;* see Him proclaiming Jehovah's name in its breadth and fulness, wherever he came; in the villages, towns, cities, the synagogues, the temple, the open-air assemblies. Hear (ver. 12), his unutterable groanings when "*sorrowful* unto death." Then hear in

* "Noluit enim loqui separatus, qui noluit esse separatus."—August.

Digitized by Google

ver. 15, his foretelling Israel's desolation, and that of others like them, because of his rejection, while ver. 16 pictures the "joy and peace in believing," with the ultimate result in the ages to come, the joy of the kingdom. It would be endless were we to dwell* on the rich and copious suggestions afforded by almost every verse. It is a manual of the History of Redemption. It is

Messiah exhibited as our full Sacrifice and full Salvation.

Psalm XLI.

The melancholy interest attached to this Psalm has made it well-known in Zion. Our Lord quoted it as his own, on the night when he was betrayed, (see John xiii. 18, compared with ver. 9,) when he saw the traitor take his seat at the Passover table with him, and sit down on his left hand, so near that he could hand him the sop, and dip with him in the dish. The strain, however, is such as suits his family as well as himself; they may use it in Him.

It is the Lord who says, "*Blessed is he that acts wisely toward the poor,*" ver. 1; the same who said "*Blessed are the merciful!*" and the same who, on the day of his Coming, shall say, "I was sick, and ye visited me." He encourages us to do good works in his Name, and especially to those of the household of faith. What is written from ver. 1 to 3 is a promise which *Barzillai* could have claimed; and *Ebedmelech,* who drew Jeremiah from the pit; and *Onesiphorus,* who oft refreshed Paul; and the women of Galilee, Susannah and others, who ministered to Christ of their substance, and the *daughters of Jerusalem,* who gave him sympathy as he bore the cross, pitying his marred countenance.

Perhaps in ver. 4 Christ may be understood as saying, "I, even I myself, did that to others, and do, therefore, claim the blessing. But how differently my foes act toward me. All my miracles of kindness are forgotten, the memory of all my thousand benefits is drowned in their malice; they wish my death, 'When shall He die;' and 'his name perish?'" (Ver. 5.)

"Some cursed thing cleaves to him." (Ver. 8.)

But the issue shall disappoint them; I shall not even once err, and I shall soon stand at thy right hand.

"And as for me, thou upholdest me in my integrity,
And settest me before thy face for ever;" (Ver. 12.)

anticipating the reward of his obedience unto death, and "*the glory that should follow,*" as we too may do.

* The much disputed passage, ver. 6, "*thou hast dug through my ears,*" or "*thou hast prepared ears for me,*" is rendered "A body hast thou prepared for me," Heb. x. 5; because his taking our human nature was the first and most direct step to his being made our servant, like the man *whose ears were bored* to the door-post; or rather, to his being a Priest prepared for his office, by having his ears tipt with blood, as Lev. xiv. 14. Exod. xxix. 20.

Digitized by Google

It is interesting to hear Him say, "Blessed be *Jehovah, God of Israel.*" (Ver. 13.) The rejected and despised One has not forgotten or given up the people who rejected him. He will be their King, "King *of the Jews,*" though they crucify him; he intends grace and glory for them in the latter day. "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art *the King of Israel.*" And that "*Amen and Amen,*" how sweetly it drops from the lips of the Faithful Witness, who delighted to preface his weighty sayings with "Verily, verily," *Αμην, Αμην,* and who fixes his mark to this blessed Psalm, as if, like Paul in some of his Epistles, he would say, "The signature of me, the Faithful Witness, with mine own hand."

The Righteous One unpitied in his time of need.

Psalm XLII.

The Jews begin *Book II.* with this Psalm. I have little doubt that this division of the Book of Psalms is arbitrary, and was suggested by the single circumstance that "*Amen*" happens to occur as the first word of Ps. xl., lxxii., lxxxix., and cvi., which are the closing ones of the different divisions.

Here is the *hart in the wilderness panting for the water brooks* which it had not got at. It is on some bank that hangs over (עַל, see Hengst.) the brook,—the water is not reached. Such is the Psalmist's state of soul. "O that I might see the face of God!" is the force of ver. 2; and ver. 4 is the soul responding to itself, saying, in remembrance of past joys now withheld, "Thereon will I think, and pour out my soul within myself."

The Septuagint has translated this very nearly in the words used in Matt. xxvi. 38, and John xii. 27.

"Why art thou ("περιλυπας") very sorrowful, O my soul?
And why art thou (συν ταρασσεις με) troubled within me?"

Our Lord, as well as every troubled and sorrowful one of his people, could use all this Psalm, when, as the true David, he was driven out, not by a son, but by his Father for our sakes—driven farther from heaven than Hermon or Jordan, or "the Little Hill," were from Zion and the Tabernacle; hearing deeper floods calling to one another, and mustering their waters, as at the Deluge the cataracts dashed upon the ark from above, while bursting fountains heaved it up from below. Still, He knew the issue; "for the joy set before Him he endured the cross." He could sing in the gloom, "*I shall yet praise Him,* the salvation of my countenance, and *my God!*"—(ver. 11,) who shall change my marred form, and give me beauty; who shall change my humiliation into exaltation; who shall in my case, and then in the case of all my people, exchange the wilderness and its parched sands for the kingdom and its rivers of pleasure.

The sorest pang to Christ, arising from reproach and scorn, was that which he felt when they cast suspicion on the love and faithfulness

Digitized by Google

of his Father (ver. 10), "*Where is thy God?*" In proportion as sanctification advances, his members feel this too, forgetting their own glory, and intent upon his. In the primary use of the Psalm, this taunt would be felt by David, when his enemies insinuated that though God had anointed him king, yet he could not bring him to his kingdom; or, if "the *sons of Korah*" wrote this Psalm, in their days (as Hengstenberg thinks), still there would be the same feeling in them in regard to this taunt flung at that devoted leader, whose cause they espoused, openly at Ziklag. (1 Chron. xii. 6.) But the Holy Ghost founded on these circumstances a song of Zion, which was meant for Zion's King, and all his princes, in their passage to the throne and kingdom. The Lord Jesus might specially call it to mind, and sing it with his disciples on that remarkable day when at *Cæsarea Philippi* (Matt. xvi. 13), he asked what men were saying of him? On that day, Hermon was in sight, and Jordan's double-fountain close beside him; and some "*Little Hill,*" near which they sat was the "*Mizar,*"* that, by contrast, called up to mind the *Hills of Zion.* On that day, it may be, the Head of the Church made special use of this Psalm, and embalmed it in the hearts of his disciples, who would never afterward fail to sing it (even as we may do), with double refreshment in the thought that it had comforted the Master, expressing

The Righteous One's weary looking up to the Father for refreshment.

Psalm LXIII.

Many ancient and modern writers make this Psalm a part of the former. They have failed to see that the strain is now more gladsome and hopeful. *The hart is now bounding on to the water-brooks.* The psalmist is claiming his right to refreshment, and anticipating it as just at his lips. The gloom of "mourning" is to be exchanged for favour or "light" (ver. 3), and "truth," *i.e.*, the fulfilment of the promises made to him (Aben-Ezra) is on its way; and soon his God shall be his jubilee-song, "joy of his joy," and the harp shall celebrate the uplifted countenance of "Eloi, Eloi," my God, who once seemed to stand afar off.

To Christ and to his members, the complete day of Jubilee-gladness comes, when "the salvation," noticed Ps. xlii. 11, shall be accomplished. But the joy of ver. 4 seems to be that which the *altar, with its accepted sacrifice,* produces. It is Christ risen, and Christ ascended, that are pointed at therein; for there we see the sacrifice on the altar accepted fully, and our hearts learn true joy. No doubt this same source of joy is to be opened up to us more fully still when He appears the second time "without sin" unto salvation, and all

* Tucker has made an interesting suggestion, though it will not bear examination: "I will remember thee *concerning* the land" (מִ). God's past mercies displayed there, at the miraculous passage of the river *Jordan,* and the getting possession of the land even to *Hermon;* and then "The Little Hill" is *Zion* itself, only great because the Tabernacle is there. But the construction of the Hebrew refuses to yield this sense.

Digitized by Google

enemies are put under Him. He, too, shall rejoice afresh in that day, drinking of the coolest of the longed-for water brooks. Let us, meanwhile, read and sing this Psalm in happy confidence, as

The Righteous One's claim of right to full refreshment.

Mark XIII. 32—37.

"But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." &c., &c.

When the Lord Jesus Christ parted from his disciples on the mount of Olives, and in their presence entered his cloudy chariot, and rose to heaven, it was said to them by the two angels who appeared, "This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." He often told them the same truth himself; and in connexion with the solemn event of his second coming, the great duty inculcated is *watchfulness.* "Take ye heed," says He, "watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is." And then, as if anticipating that some might suppose his words were for the disciples only, He concludes his discourse thus, "What I say unto you I say unto all, *watch.*" And as He simply told them that the time of his coming was not known but unto the Father, and had given them no indication as yet that it would be either a long or short period, we cannot doubt that with the eye of their faith and the desires of their hearts heavenwards they longed and waited for his appearing. They watched according to his word, and who can doubt that they were the better for their watching, although they lived not to see their Lord return? We know that the primitive Church for a long time lived in the same vigilant attitude, and cherished the same gladsome expectations, and who can doubt that this kept her loose to the things of earth, and checked and subdued her carnal desires, and ripened and mellowed her heaven sent graces.

It is different with the Church of Christ now. She has not been watching for the return of her Lord. That is an incontestable fact. It will not be denied by any who are acquainted with the condition of the Church of Christ, that in so far as his second coming is concerned, she has been but wholly asleep. Whatever believers may have been watching for there can be no doubt of this, that they have not been watching for the second coming of Christ. And as that duty is so expressly laid upon them by Christ himself, and as he has never given any indication that it might at any time be relaxed, and as the example of the first believers is an additional argument for it, we must hold that the Church now is to be blamed in this matter. The second advent of the Lord has been comparatively forgotten. It has occupied no prominent place in the ministrations of God's house, and it has occupied no prominent place in the meditations of God's people.

And how can this difference be accounted for when the duty in question is not only clearly revealed, and strictly enforced? How comes it that the Church, in some measure anxious to cultivate every

Digitized by Google

Christian grace and to practise every Christian duty, is yet so much farther behind in this than in any other duty, or in any other grace? The answer to this question will be given as we proceed, but in the meantime we may state that we consider the reason to be, that she has regarded the coming of Christ as *Post-Millennial*,—she has introduced a whole millennium between the present time and that event, and she cannot, therefore,—no, she *cannot* watch for it if she would. She acknowledges, and the word is so clear, that she must acknowledge, that the Lord has commanded her to watch; but she has for the greater part adopted a system of interpretation regarding future events quite incompatible with her discharge of that great duty; and adhering to that system she must forego her watchfulness, and has done it, rather than adhere to her watchfulness, and seek an interpretation consistent with it.

I. It may be well to advert to a few passages of Scripture, from which we think it may be clearly established that the advent of the Lord is before the Millennium, and the first is the noted passage in Second Thessalonians. From that passage it would appear that the mind of the Thessalonian Church had been troubled by opinions propagated probably by some well-meaning but misguided persons to the effect that the day of the Lord was at hand, and the apostle hearing of their alarm, writes to assure them that these opinions were erroneous, for that Christ would not come until there had appeared first a falling away from the simplicity of the truth, and Antichrist, the man of sin, had risen, and reigned his day. "Then," says he, "the Lord will appear in his glory, and shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming, that wicked one." There can be no doubt surely that the apostle is speaking here of the second personal coming of Christ. The way in which the chapter opens is proof of it: "We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him." The very purpose for which he evidently wrote the epistle is proof of it. It was the personal coming of Christ concerning which they had been troubled, and therefore the *same* concerning which he wrote, when his purpose was to remove that trouble, and set their minds at rest as to the *time* of it. What does he say, then, concerning the time of Christ's coming? Simply that it could not be till Antichrist be revealed, which Antichrist had not yet arisen, and that then Christ would come and destroy him. But where is there any mention of a thousand years preceding that advent? Does not the apostle evidently cover the whole period between the date of this epistle and the advent of Christ with this one event—the *manifestation* of *the man of sin?* But had Paul believed that Christ's coming was to be preceded by a thousand years of unspeakable blessedness and undisturbed rest to the Church of God, was it at all likely that he would have omitted all mention of it in these words—was it natural to have passed it over? On the contrary, what would have been more suitable consolation to the troubled minds of the brethren at Thessalonica than the assurance that, before Christ came, this millennium of blessedness was to come? But there is not the most distant or indirect hint of it in all his epistles from beginning to

Digitized by Google

end. But that is not all: we hold that there is very clear evidence from this epistle that it did not exist in his own mind, for if it had, and if it had been an article of belief in those days, surely he would not have allowed the Thessalonians to escape a sharp rebuke for letting fall from their creed an article so important in itself, and the presence of which would have saved them all their alarm. Plainly, then, the Thessalonians did not believe in any millennium antecedent to Christ's coming, else there would have been no commotion among them at this time, and it is as plain that Paul did not supply them with any such notion at a time when we cannot conceive he could have avoided it, had it been entertained by himself.

The next passage to which we direct attention is the 12th chapter of Daniel, ver. 2, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." This is clearly a description of the resurrection, and admitted on all hands to be so, and it is immediately preceded in the first verse by the restoration of the Jews, and that again is immediately preceded by the destruction of Antichrist. After this there follows a description of the blessedness of the righteous in the millennial state, when it is said they shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever. Here, then, we have grouped together the destruction of Antichrist, the resurrection of the just, the restoration of Israel, all preceding the millennium. Well, then, the destruction of Antichrist, as we have seen, is accomplished by the *brightness of his coming.* The restoration of Israel is also synchronous with it, for it is written that their house is left unto them desolate, *until they shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.* And again, the resurrection of the dead and the advent of the Lord also occur at the same time. "The Lord my God *shall come and all the saints with thee.*" Thus there can be no millennium until Christ come, for Antichrist is to survive and flourish till then, and surely it could not do so through the whole course of the millennial period. Israel is not to be restored till then, and surely there could be no millennium without that people whose are the promises. The just are not to be raised till then.

Another passage bearing on the same point is Isa. xxv. 8, "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken it." Here, again, is a grouping together of the same truths, the destruction of Antichrist, the resurrection of the just, and the restoration of Israel. And when all these things are accomplished, then, adds the prophet, "It shall be said, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." There can be no question, surely, that this passage refers to the resurrection. The Apostle Paul puts it beyond a doubt by citing it in 1 Cor. xv. 54, for, says he, then, "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written,

Digitized by Google

Death is swallowed up in victory;" and, if so,—if that saying is fulfilled, then there can, of course, be no millennium before Christ comes.

II. We must recur to the duty of watchfulness, and endeavour to show that our interpretation of these passages is the only one consistent with this duty. And in the outset it may be as well to dispose of an objection with which we are very often met.

When such Scriptures as these adverted to are quoted, we are told that they must not be considered as having any reference at all to Christ's coming, but only to our death; for, it is said, the day of death is virtually to us the day of Christ's coming. Now we cannot suppose that our Lord would have adopted a phraseology, and used it so frequently regarding death, which we cannot help thinking was calculated to mislead, and which was contrary to his usual practice in administering counsel and instruction both to his disciples and to the multitude at large, and the more especially that there cannot be assigned for it any satisfactory reason. Christ says, "*Watch for the coming of the Son of man.*" Post-millennialists read, "*Watch for your dissolution.*" Christ says, "Watch and *pray* for the coming of the Son of man." Post-millennialists read, "Watch and *pray* for your dissolution"—the separation of the soul and body. To say the least, this is surely an exceedingly unnatural twisting of Christ's words; and it is very remarkable that it is not supported by any one parallel passage in which death is substituted for Christ's coming. Had it been death that was intended, it is most natural to suppose that *that* word would have been used, or if not it is most difficult not to suppose that there would have been some parallel passages in which the meaning would have been made plain. When Christ's coming is spoken of, and I am told that he means not his coming, but my death, I am entitled to say that is a most arbitrary rendering of Christ's words, which is sanctioned by no example. But again, it is natural enough to expect that we should be exhorted to watch for death, but certainly we are not so prepared to expect to be exhorted or commanded to pray for it. And if the interpretation we are combating is the true one, we know not who complies with the Lord's commandment. Are any who hold this rendering prepared to say they are obeying the exhortation, and not only watching, but also *praying* for death? Still further, let us consider an incident in Scripture which we consider pretty decisive on the point. After the Lord had revealed to Peter by what death he should glorify God, he was anxious to know what should become of John, and put the question to Jesus. The answer was, "If I will that *he tarry till I come*, what is that to thee?" Now, how did the disciples understand the expression, *till I come?* Did they think it was death? Did they think it could *possibly* mean death? No such idea entered their minds. They were of one opinion as to the meaning, for it is added, "Then went that saying abroad, that that disciple should not die." Now this was after the resurrection. It was, therefore, long after they had been familiar with Christ's repeated exhortations to watch and pray for his coming; and this, we think, should settle the question as to what *they* understood these exhortations to be.

Digitized by Google

We do not think it necessary to dwell longer on this objection. We believe, for many more reasons than we have stated, that when Christ speaks of his coming, he means his coming, and not our death. His coming to us is surely not identical in meaning with our going to him. We are told to pray for his coming, for he is our Friend. We are not told to pray for death, for death is our enemy.

"Watch ye therefore, for ye know not when the Master of the house cometh; and what I say unto you I say unto all, *Watch.*" We are surely entitled to believe, aye, and bound to believe, that God will not require us to do an impossible thing. He requires us in these words to watch for his coming; but if at the same time he has declared that before his coming there shall intervene a period of no less than 1000 years, then he does require us to do that which is not difficult only, but impossible. Faith may embrace miracles and mysteries, but it cannot embrace, and it is not required to embrace, impossibilities. This duty is expressly and repeatedly enjoined by Christ on all his disciples. He tells us all we must watch for his return—we must have our lamps brightly burning and well trimmed, and our vessels supplied with oil, so that there be no moment when the bridegroom returning to his bride may come upon us unawares; but what need of this continued preparation, this constant looking forth from our chambers, if it is fixed in heaven and recorded on earth that the *One* we long and look for will not come till there has passed away, at the least, 1000 years of peace, and rest, and triumph? To watch for any event, implies that it may come at any given moment; and if there is not this expectation and belief, we hold that watching for it there cannot be. We have here a plain and positive requirement to look out for a certain event—to be so vigilant as never to sleep like the foolish virgins, and never to allow the lights to be extinguished or wax dim,—can there be alongside of that requirement a positive declaration that the looked-for event is distant a thousand years? Most certainly there is not, and there must therefore be mistake somewhere. The mistake must be as regards the time of the Lord's advent; for regarding the duty of watchfulness there cannot be, and there are not, two opinions.

If it is a duty at all there must be beneficial results, and we think we can see abundant reasons for the command to watch, in the sanctifying effect of watchfulness. Let a man only be in the position of an expectant for the appearing of his Judge—let him only feel and believe that between him and that momentous event there is nothing, or almost nothing to be fulfilled—that his lot has fallen amid the declining days of the world—that the sun of God's favour is about to set in thickest night on a rebellious world—to be followed by the dawning of the morning of the world's jubilee, and we should confidently look for a holy, heavenly effect of those views of divine truth. We should expect him to act and to live as a man who had received his summons to take his stand at the grand assize of the great God. We should expect him to sit loose to earthly things, and to regard earthly ties as temporary restraints which bind him to present duty, in the discharge of which he is tutored and prepared for that

Digitized by Google

higher state of being to which he has been called, and for which he was made. These views of truth we think peculiarly fitted for elevating and purifying the spiritual man, for they not only make him conversant with the things of heaven, but they bring the things of heaven specially near, and by shewing the uncertain tenure of the things of earth, they lift the soul above them. At once it will be objected that the uncertainty of death may produce the same results. We answer that whatever benefit might have been expected from the uncertainty of death, the whole experience of the human race testifies that it has not produced these sanctifying results. It may not be our business to account for this, but we would say, that while in the case of the man who is watching and longing for the return of his Lord, he finds that there is nothing he knows of to prevent that return immediately, in the case of the man who is supposed to be influenced in the same way by the uncertainty of life, there are many things to which he clings as refuges in the *nearness* of death. He has some hope, for example, in his own careful use of the means to preserve life—he has another source of hope from the old age attained by many of his fellow-men, and, while in the enjoyment of health, there is a felt stability which gives him, whether right or wrong, the consciousness of security, and a feeling that death is *not near*. Few think it near, for, as the poet says, "all men think all men mortal but themselves," and whatever motives to sanctification there may be, we are persuaded that very little is to be imputed to the uncertainty of life.

But again, the Scriptures evidently ascribe some special blessing to those who wait and watch for the coming of the Lord. Paul, when drawing near his end, writes to Timothy: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Again it is written, "Blessed is he that watcheth." If, then, the Lord has commanded us to watch for his coming, there will be bestowed, we had almost said there ought to be bestowed, a special honour on those who have been looking for it, over those who have been neglecting it. It was so at his first coming. To the wise men in the East, who waited for him, a star, or special light from heaven, appeared, and guided them to the birth-place of their longed-for Redeemer. To the shepherds, who kept their flocks by night in the fields, the angel of the Lord appeared, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them, and they too were directed to the stable of Bethlehem, by the messengers of heaven. Simeon waited and watched for his appearing, and he was not suffered to see death until he had seen the Lord's Christ, and lifted him in his arms and blessed him. There were special honours bestowed on those who seemed to be looking out for the first appearing of Christ, although there were many more entertaining no expectation of his coming, who afterwards shared the benefits and blessings of his life and death.

If there is any benefit, any honour, any distinction to be awarded at the coming of Christ, let us watch for it, yea, although there is none, yet if the Lord is coming, if he is at hand, if he has commanded us

Digitized by Google

to watch like faithful stewards, and especially if there are signs of his approach, manifestly appearing from day to day, shall we not watch? The exhortation comes with peculiar appropriateness to us in whose day there seem to be converging many prophetic times, and before whose eyes there have manifestly appeared many striking signs. We certainly live in remarkable times, and it cannot be denied that the time in which we live is more remarkable than any other since the commencement of the Christian era. The chief subject of prophecy is the Church, and the Church's great enemy, Antichrist, and the theatre on which the events connected with these transpire is the Roman empire, long since broken up into its ten divisions. Now it is just this Empire, in its decem-regal state, in which such strange things have so recently occurred, and which have drawn the wondering eyes of the whole world. That is the prophetic field, so to speak, the field which God hath chosen on which to work his wonderful work of judgment and mercy in the times to come. And when we see that these thrones have been laid in the dust, and those who sat on them were glad to seek an asylum on a foreign shore, and that states have been dismembered, and all the former condition of things completely revolutionized—when we see that Antichrist himself has been stricken with great amazement, as if God had begun to breathe destruction on the seat of the Beast, to the wonder of all Christendom—when we see all this, can we doubt that the finger of God is in it, and that it is according to his own revealed purpose? God's strange work of judgment upon all who oppose themselves to Christ and his cause, brings mercy and enduring peace to his long-tried Church, and when we see that work begun shall we not lift up our heads and rejoice, believing that our redemption draweth nigh. The late convulsions over the face of Europe, may be indications of the approaching millennial rest of this troubled world, and the glorious reward of God's persecuted Church; and it is highly becoming, surely, that those who have so deep an interest in these purposes of God, should give heed to his providences and all his words of warning and instruction. It is not at all likely that the things which have happened in our day, so important in themselves, and so important in their effects on the Church of God, which has been his great care during the whole past history of the world, and for the sake of which, though mean in the eyes of men, he has overruled the chief movements of the greatest Empires, and overturned the most stable thrones; it is not at all likely, we say, that these things should have been omitted in the prophetic word; and, therefore, when we see such things come to pass, and that at a time when the wisest and most politic statesmen were not expecting them, and without any very direct or apparent human means (although all such instruments are entirely at God's command), can we forbear comparing the word with the open facts, to see whether or not they correspond; and inquiring to what extent we and the whole Church are affected by what is transpiring around us? We may be living at the very point where many of the last prophetic times converge. We may be standing on the very eve of the greatest changes this world

Digitized by Google

has ever seen. Ere our natural life is half done, He who hath warned us to watch may have approached this world in "rainbow-wreath and robes of storm," to make all things new; and surely it behoves every one of us most earnestly to inquire, "What saith the Scripture?" This duty is, of course, not at all dependant on peculiar views of prophecy—it is not necessarily connected with a belief of the pre-millennial advent of the Lord. It may be, and we believe it is, the case, that where this duty has been most faithfully performed—where the study of prophecy has been most diligently prosecuted, it has led to the adoption of that peculiar view. But while this may prove something in favour of the pre-millennial doctrine, it militates nothing against the duty of every one of us to search and see what God hath written.

Some men are afraid of the study of prophecy, lest they be found prying into the secret things which belong to God. Are they not afraid, lest they be found neglecting the revealed things which belong unto us? We ask them not to pry into secret things, we ask them merely to look at what is revealed, and they have no reason to say that any one thing revealed in this book is secret, and not intended for our meditation. It is not only open, but we are commanded to search it, and promised a rich blessing if we read and understand it.

How peculiarly binding on us the duty of searching the Scriptures, and the duty of constant watchfulness are, the signs with which we are surrounded abundantly teach. We are evidently in the thick of the signs of the end. The Gospel shall be preached to all nations *as a witness*, and then shall the end come. Is not that sign fulfilled? Has not the Gospel been preached *as a witness* to all nations already? We have seen in the last few years that the nations have been shaken—the seas and the waves (which are allowed to be the multitudes of people), have been roaring; and more recently we have had, as it were, Antichrist's last expiring effort for universal dominion. The man of sin has made a crafty, insidious, but, at the same time, most daring attack on the nation which may be considered the citadel of God's truth, and over which there has waved the banner inscribed, "Liberty to the oppressed, and salvation to the lost." To pluck away that banner, and to spread over this nation a dark funeral pall, and to extinguish our liberty to read and know the mind of God is the object and aim of the man of sin. What that plot is—how long ago it was concocted—who are all concerned in it—how it is to be executed, and what will be the dire and dreadful issues of it, we cannot definitely say; but when taken in connexion with the revealed purposes of God, and with the future fortunes of his now militant, and soon to be triumphant Church, it deeply concerns every one of us to ponder these things. It is written that this man of sin will be destroyed by the brightness of the Lord's coming. It is also written that the period allowed him for his wearing out the saints of the Most High God is 1,260 years, and these years are at or about their close. It is also written that in the last days perilous times shall come, and a struggle shall be endured between the powers of evil and the saints of God; and whether the present aggression on our liberties, with which we are battling and

Digitized by Google

trying to drive back, be the beginnings of that sore trial, it behoves every man to consider for himself. That there shall be such things before the end we believe—whether this is the immediate precursor of the end or not, we do not presume to say; but we are bold to say, *it is like it*. It is like what we may expect—it is like what is written.

There may be a struggle now, and if so, it will be a severe one—a struggle in which every man's faith will be tried as gold is tried in the fire—a struggle through which no hypocrite will survive—a struggle over which no mere profession will triumph—a struggle in which all wood, and hay, and stubble will perish—a struggle from which the ransomed of the Lord alone shall come forth with the shout of victory, and shall enter with honour and joy on their blood-bought inheritance.

Surely prophecy is of some use, and it is time men were looking into it; it is time now we had settled our whereabouts, and inquired into what is past and what is coming. We have been sailing prosperously over smooth seas, under the genial influence of soft and favourable winds, and if now a dark night be mantling round, and an angry sky has gathered stormy clouds, and the wild waves are tossing us hither and thither, it is surely time we were consulting our chart to see whether these breakers a-head do not portend some sunken rocks, among which we may be in danger of foundering. It is time we had the garment of the Redeemer's righteousness wrapped closely round, that from the storm and tempest of the latter day we might emerge unscathed, and present before a glorious Church, and a glorified Redeemer, the true and faithful image of Himself. It is time we had our lamps trimmed, and our eye turned to the glorious promises of the latter day, for the Lord *may be*—to say the least—the Lord may be at hand.

Surely the oppressed are weary of warfare—the benighted weary of darkness—the disappointed and patient weary of waiting—and every believer is surely weary of sin. Is not his cry and prayer, Oh, that it were crushed, extinguished, annihilated; oh, to be freed, entirely freed, from this awful evil! Would that it had no more power, and that the longing soul were emancipated from this dark, cruel prison-house of evil, and were free, like the bird with an eye that never winks, and a wing that never tires, to shoot forth into the full blaze of that glorious light in which the pure angels breathe. Would that day were come when sin shall be no more—when this world shall be all pure, the saints all clean—when the curse shall be wiped away, and death shall die! Oh, what a world to live in, a world without sin! a people all righteous! It cheers one's heart to think of it—what will it be to see it. Would that these days were come! and blessed be God, *they shall come*. Yes, sin will be extinguished—the curse will be wiped away—and this emancipated soul shall praise for ever the eternal God.

Digitized by Google

Reviews.

Pre-millennialism a Delusion. By a Member of the Presbytery of Northumberland. Johnstone and Hunter. 1851.

We did not intend to return to this volume. Its title was singularly unbecoming, and not calculated to win. Its unmeekness, egotism, and overweening vanity, were not likely to make it attractive to any one in whose estimation humility and modesty are Christian graces. Its extraordinary and exclusive assumption of learning, logic, criticism, metaphysics, theology, were not fitted to recommend it to any inquirer after truth. Its avoidance of all argument and preference for oracular statement, rendered it quite innocuous. Its entire antagonism in most points to Mr. Brown's work seemed to give it chiefly the air of an attack upon all former defenders of the author's own theory, as if he had come forward to proclaim how entirely dissatisfied he was with their mode of defence, and his conviction that now, for the first time, Post-millennialism had found a champion worthy of it, and Pre-millennialism an adversary whose every argument is, by itself, an absolute demonstration,—an adversary who has taken the difficulties attaching to our system, and laid them on it " like an annihilating incubus " (p. 138); who, though he has " no wish to *rake in the dust-heaps* to bring to light the delusions and worse in whose company this theory has not seldom been found," yet hints to us with most significant complacency, that we owe a great deal to his forbearance in this respect, for he has the power, though not the "wish, to call Church history to give the testimony it is well competent to do, not only to show what sort of company this theory has kept, but to shew that *it occupies the place in many of the delusions which not a few criminals have assigned to Sabbath-breaking* in their career." (P. 106.) We thought that, if the book were deemed worthy of an answer, that that answer should have come from our Post-millennial friends more than from us. We thought that Mr. Brown should have taken up the former part of the book, and Mr. Fairbairn the latter. But the following letter from the author, which we give fully below, has led us to return to his book.*

* *To the Editor of the " Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."*

Sir,—A review of the book, "Pre-millenialism a Delusion," in your Journal for October, has been brought under my notice. No author has any right to complain of that which his reviewer may say, provided the remarks made preserve the excellent rule of being *true.* But when that which is not true is stated, the party aggrieved has a right to be heard. I have no desire to criticise the language of your review, nor to characterise its spirit. It may serve to blind some of your readers, but will not do much towards elucidating the truth of God. It rings the changes upon pride, ignorance, and all that sort of thing, and suggests the alternative of "wilful perversion." At all this I could smile with pity. But it does more: it makes unqualified statements which are

Digitized by Google

Let us look at this letter. And first we acknowledge the blunder which is adverted to in the conclusion. It was occasioned by our striking out a paragraph in the MS., and neglecting to fit the two broken extremities into one another. We did not notice it till too late.

positive untruths. Were it not to take notice of these, I would have held my peace. In writing the volume you have reviewed, my plan did not permit me to criticise books, nor to mention the names of Pre-millennial writers. And because I gave little indication of the extent of my reading on the subject, without the slightest foundation, and without any means of knowing, you make the unqualified statement,—"He has not read a single book on the subject—does not know what Pre-millenialists hold, or what arguments they use;" and again, "His acquaintance with his subject is very limited—he has read nothing upon the subject," &c. Sir, this is simply not true. You can mention few standard works on either side that I have not consulted, and several of them read again and again. I did not refer to these, because I was writing against a *system* which is already running to seed—a system which has led one of its most amiable advocates to speak of the "human person" of our Lord, and one of its prophetic students to deny the Eternal Sonship, and "to vent almost all the heresies of the first four centuries concerning the person of our Lord." You speak very much of my "ignorance;" were you aware of what I have now stated?

Seeing the charge of "ignorance" will not stand, you will adopt "the alternative of wilful perversion." Sir, I am ready to meet the charge where and how you please. And with what success may appear from the only instance you have particularized. You accuse me of "inventing an unfounded piece of slander" against the author of the "*Brochure*," "Erchomena." He may thank you for dragging in his name. I shall not follow your example. Thousands will know the author who have never heard of the book he has written.

After quoting from the volume, you review the sentence in which "Erchomena" is referred to, you say:—"There are only two allusions to Missionary Societies in the work, at pp. 69, and 78, and both contain the very opposite of sneers or ridicule. We will extend to the Northumbrian Anti-Delusionist the charitable excuse that he never read the book that he reviles. Yet it is one of the worst instances either of ignorance or misrepresentation that could be produced." These are your words. What will your readers think of your honesty, or "ignorance," when I tell them that I referred to page 60, where they will find these words, "The bulk of the Christian Church," "the greater part of the Christian Church have swerved from the plain sense of Scripture; and have turned to the phantomizing system of the Budhists, who believe that the future happiness of mankind will consist in moving about in the air, and suppose . . . . . . that for the coming of the *Lord* they must understand the progress of the *Missionary Societies;* and going up to the mountain of the Lord's house signifies a grand *Class-meeting of the Methodists.*" True, these words were originally penned by Joseph Wolff; but I have yet to learn that a book which quotes them with approbation, and adopts them with such marked approval, is not to be held accountable for the sentiments they convey. Especially when, on turning to page 69, we find, "the delusion—the innocent mistake" (strange synonymes!) of the Missionary Societies innocently suggested. Sir, I have been accused in your pages of "slander." Your readers will judge which of us is the culprit.

On the expression, "The dead *in Christ shall rise first,*" you say, "What intelligent Pre-millennialist ever dreamed of assigning to the passage the meaning here combated?" A book which you characterize as "this excellent little work," after referring to Rev. xx., has these words: "We are often told that the *dead in Christ rise first*, and here we are told that after their resurrection, a thousand years, triumphant years, are to elapse ere the rising of the rest of the dead." We can quote from others if required.

Digitized by Google

As, however, it does the author no injustice, but affords him an occasion for a retort, we need not dwell on it. Had it injured him, we should have apologised; but, as it only injures ourselves, we let it alone.

Next as to our charge of unacquaintance with the subject and its literature. The author denies it. We have simply to *repeat* it, and to say that a second perusal of his book has greatly confirmed our opinion. He knows almost nothing upon the controversy. There are two ways in which a man's unacquaintance with a subject, shews itself; in his never having read a word upon it, or in his having *so* read as that he still remains in the same profound ignorance as before. If we seemed to attribute the former kind of unacquaintance to our author, it was to avoid imputing the latter. We could not have believed that he had read anything on the subject, so entirely has he mistaken or lost sight of both the strong and the weak points of the case. A man may run his eye over the six books of Euclid in an hour, and say he has read them, but if he cannot solve one problem, or demonstrate one theorem, nay, if he mistakes the very enunciations, what sort of reading has it been? We shall shew, ere we close, that our author has misquoted his Greek Testament in a way which indicates most lamentable unacquaintance with it, yet he speaks in several places, as if almost no one had read it but himself! We never did read any controversial work which betrayed more entire ignorance of the controversy, and yet such perfect conviction that nobody save the author knew it at all.*

Our author speaks of our system as "running to seed," and charges on it all the heresies of the first four centuries, &c. As usual, he produces no authority, and we leave, therefore, his statement as it stands—only

You say, "He never tries to prove his theory from Scripture;" there is "not a proof-text to build his theory upon; Scripture seems not required to prove Pre-millennialism a delusion." Did you turn up the texts to which I referred? Very possibly you had not time. Well, Sir, I will now give you a distinct challenge: I am prepared to prove, in your own columns, or any other way, by a distinct reference to every text on the subject in the Bible, that the Word of God gives no countenance to the theory you defend. And this without having any recourse to "offensive" generalization. The Church of God shall then judge of the truth or delusion of a theory, the nature of which you are, alas! in much ignorance of.

I have but one remark more to make. So little do you know of the book you review, that you put the words of the "Free Church Magazine" into my mouth. In your last paragraph you say, "We return to the author. . . . . . 'For some time past,' he writes, 'we have been led to believe that the Pre-millennial theory was approaching its close.'" Do you refer these words to me? for on the strength of them you administer your parting rebuke; or do you refer them to the Index, who absolves and praises the guilty? If to the latter, what will people think of your grammar and your "style?" If to the former, what will they think of your "ignorance," when they know that these words are not in my volume, but by a reviewer, who says in the same notice, "We are entirely unacquainted with the author?" And assuredly the learned writer of that notice in the "Free Church Magazine" was not the author of

"PRE-MILLENNIALISM A DELUSION."

* "We are as intimately acquainted with our Hebrew Bible, as any of our pre-millenarian friends." (P. 135.) Of this boasting the book is full.

Digitized by Google

reminding him of this fact, that Platonism, Origenism, Gnosticism, Romanism, Pelagianism, Socinianism, Arminianism, Rationalism, are all opponents of our system, but true friends and allies of his ; and, as these may be said to embrace all the heresies that have existed, we may aver safely that there is not one heresy, we do not say in the four first centuries, but from the times of the Apostles to our own, with which the author's system has not been associated and identified. Such, to use our author's term, is "the dust heap," out of which *his* opinions (not ours) are to be gathered.*

But one feels inclined to ask, has the author no peculiarities of opinion, seeing he is so willing to point out those of others? Let us see. By means of "pneumatology," (which he seems to think he knows), he has ascertained that "the soul of Abraham *is not an older soul than when it quitted the body,* for such language is unknown in eternity and pneumatology, and Abraham's soul is in eternity." (P. 126.) This is a bold assertion, and moreover an error of the gravest kind, for it attributes to the soul of man what belongs only to God, to whom "a thousand years are as one day." This is worse than the Nestorianism with which he charges some millennarians, it is worse than speaking of the "human person" of Christ, for the latter is but an incautious expression, the former is deliberate error. How the author came to know this, so as to be able to affirm it so confidently, we cannot say. Again we are told that "*Adam's soul is no older* now than it was when he died, *no more is his body ;* when we see him again in the resurrection, he will be exactly 930 years old." (Pp. 127, 8.) The body dissolves, and becomes extinct for a season, therefore it cannot grow old, for it does not exist as a body. This is plain enough, but to maintain that a being that continues to think and feel, does not grow older, that is, does not pass through any period of time, is to maintain that the finite has become possessed of the perfection of the infinite, or that the soul has become *extinct;* for, if not extinct, no pneumatology, not even the author's, can prove that the length of its existence has not been increased by the addition of a thousand or two thousand years. The absurdity of the statement will make it (like the book in which it is contained), a very harmless one. Otherwise, it is a gross and intolerable error (one of several doctrinal errors scattered over his work), an error evidently connected with his Post-millennial opinions, from which one may see how in him they are already "running to seed."† One of his great demonstrations, the props

* "Chiliasm constituted, in the second century, so decidedly an article of faith, that Justin held it up as a *criterion of perfect orthodoxy.*"—Semisch's Justin Martyr, vol. ii., p. 265.

† The pernicious heresy of our author is but borrowed after all, though he does not own it. Among other unsound divines who broached it, are Bishop Law and Archbishop Whately. The former carried out the idea to its legitimate extent, and denied that there is anything in man which can subsist in separation from the body. He maintains our author's conceit about time, and asserts that "the times of our death and resurrection are really coincident." In like manner, Whately asserts that "to each person the moment of his closing his eyes in death will be instantly succeeded by the sound of the last trumpet, even though ages have intervened." This is only one out of several instances in

Digitized by Google

of his Post-millennialism, is based upon this pneumatological discovery! Unless it be proved, or granted, that Abraham's soul is no older now than when he died, and that Adam's is exactly nine hundred and thirty years old just now, and to remain, like a time-piece out of order, stationary at this point till the judgment, one of his main arguments goes for nothing!*

In regard to our accusation against the author, respecting Mr. Tonna's book, we have merely *to repeat the statement we made*, with this correction, that whereas we thought the author could not have *read* the book, we now admit that he has read it; hence our charge against him now is simply that of *perversion*, not of ignorance. And not only *has* he perverted Mr. Tonna's meaning, or rather Joseph Wolff's meaning, but he is determined to pervert it still. It was not likely that Wolff,—himself a missionary (at the very time, if we remember), or Mr. Tonna, a zealous supporter of missions, would sneer at Bible Societies, or cast an "empty and verbose ridicule upon God's glorious gospel." We said something to this effect formerly, and we now find that we were right. The author, *who never gives authorities or references*, has found it needful to point out the passage to which he referred. It contains not one syllable of sneering at Bible Societies, nay it does not even *name* them. It contains no sneer at the gospel,—nay it does not even *name* it. It contains no sneer at "Methodist-meeting-houses;" nay, it does not even *name* them,—"a class-meeting of Methodists" not being the same, even in pneumatology, with a "Methodist meeting-house." The passage is a most unexceptionable one, and is intended to expose the false system of *spiritualizing* the prophecies, such as our author adopts. Because we reject the idea that the coming of the Lord is synonymous with Missionary Societies, and that the millennial going up to the house of the Lord is fulfilled in a "grand class-meeting of Methodists," or any other such

which the author has picked up strange notions from suspicious quarters, shewing but too well that his crudities all come from the borders of unsound doctrine. His authorities are Law or Whately, not Owen or Flavel or Howe. And it is by the "pneumatology" of Law and Whately, that Premillennialism is proved a delusion. Yet on neither of these dignitaries seems to have dawned the discovery that Adam's and Abraham's souls are no older now than when they died. That has been a more recent discovery.

* "It is one of the fundamental axioms of metaphysics, that a soul has no respect to space or time." (P. 196.) Our readers are, we suppose, aware that this is *not* one of the fundamental axioms of metaphysics, and that the above is merely an assertion of the author. But were it according to the axioms of human metaphysics, it is contradicted by divine metaphysics, for the souls under the altar, who are looking forward to resurrection, cry, "How long?" Could they cry, "How long," if they had no "consciousness of time's succession?" "It is an incident attaching to our state here, that we have the past and present in our ideas, but when the mortal spirit quits this sublunary sphere, it has them no longer, till the resurrection." What, then, does the disembodied soul think on? Not on the cross, or Christ crucified, for that is in the *past;* not on the glory to be revealed, for that is in the *future.* On what then does it think? Or does it think at all? Is it conscious or unconscious? Is it existent or extinct? The author is just on the brink of worse heresy,—and not the less so, because he thinks himself above even the possibility of error.

Digitized by Google

gathering of any Church, are we to be accused of "casting ridicule upon God's glorious Gospel," or "sneering at Bible Societies and Methodist meeting-houses, in a way that will gladden the heart of the veriest Jesuit?" *

The author's next reference is equally unfortunate. He had accused millenarians of misapplying the text, "The dead in Christ shall rise first." We answered, No "intelligent millenarians" ever did so. They have never attempted to prove from it the doctrine of the first resurrection, knowing that "first" has no reference to this priority. His reply is peculiar. He finds that Mr. Tonna, at p. 10, and also at p. 30, has these words:—"We are often told that the dead in Christ shall rise first," &c., and he asks us to believe that in using these words, Mr. Tonna meant to adduce them in proof of the first resurrection! Now, Mr. T. does not use them as a proof-text, but brings them in as a brief expression for the first resurrection. He founds nothing on them. He quotes all the passages in proof of the first resurrection, *yet he never refers to this.* Nay more; he has occasion twice over to quote it elsewhere (pp. 38 and 46), yet never quotes it as a *proof*, nor interprets it as our author asserts! What can a Christian man think of the author's statement? Is it fair and honest? Is it like one seeking after truth? Is it not most uncandid and unjust? He adds, "We can quote from others, if required." We should like to see the quotations.

We have farther to repeat our affirmation that the author has never attempted to prove his theory from Scripture. He has tried to take from us our proof-texts, but *he has not attempted even by one single text to prove his own.* What proof-text is there for his "Cæsarianism?" It is one very striking, nay, necessary feature of his system; but he

* We cannot do better than give the passage entire:—"Such is the bias of human nature in favour of those ideas that are pleasing and agreeable to us, that the bulk of the Christian Church, though they are assiduous in searching the Scriptures with regard to the doctrines of Christ; their eyes are blinded when they come to those passages which speak of the future restoration of the Jews, and of their conversion at the glorious appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ on Mount Zion. The greater part of the Christian Church have swerved from the plain sense of Scripture, and have turned to the phantomizing system of the Budhists, who believe that the future happiness of mankind will consist in moving about in the air, and suppose that when they are reading *Jews*, they must understand Gentiles, and when they read *Jerusalem*, they must understand the *Church;* and if it is said *earth* it means *sky;* and for the coming of the Lord, they must understand the progress of the Missionary Societies, and going up to the mountain of the Lord's house signifies a grand class-meeting of Methodists." This is the whole passage. Our readers will search in vain for any reference to Bible Societies or Methodist meeting-houses, or the Gospel. It sneers at none of them. Yet on this our author founds the invective referred to. So far, then, from *retracting* our former remarks, we adhere to them; nay, more, were it not that we have no wish to deal hardly, we feel inclined to make some additions, so strange, so reprehensible, does our author's conduct seem. One thing we learn from it, not to trust his quotations or references. He seems to write at random, and to expect that his readers will take his word for his assertions. We shall see in a little somewhat more of his misquotations, and how completely he has misled his readers even as to texts of Scripture.

Digitized by Google

has not one text to prove it! What proof-text does he bring to show that Christ underwent a first resurrection on the cross?* What proof-text has he to show that the Millennium is to begin in Scotland?† What text has he to prove that the Antediluvians attempted to burn Noah and the ark? What proof has he that "the nature which the devil assumed, when tempting Eve, was so far above himself as to be rightly termed his head?" How the serpentine nature is superior to the angelic, as the author asserts, we do not know. That the serpent is called Satan's head, we do not believe, for not only does Scripture not warrant this, but the belief of it must subvert the whole plan of redemption. Fuller *does* make a distinction certainly between the serpent and his head—(so does every commentator)—but not to maintain our author's idea. As little does Milton, to whom the author refers, in a very patronizing way. There are some ten or eleven references in "Paradise Lost" to this bruising of the head, but instead of "working out the idea excellently" (p. 86), that the nature assumed by the devil was "so far above himself as to be rightly termed his head," he represents him as loathing the degradation he was submitting to:—

> "O foul *descent!* that I who erst contended
> With gods to sit the highest, am now constrained
> Into a beast, and mixed with bestial slime,
> This essence to incarnate and imbrute," &c.—B. ix. 163.

What proof-text has he to show that the coming of the Lord means death? What text to prove that there can be "no interval of time between temporal death and the coming of the Lord?" (P. 124.)‡ What proof-text to show that the souls of Adam and Abraham are not older now than when they died? What proof-text has he to show

* He speaks of "the spiritual death of the Lord," p. 97. Most improper language—language which makes one shudder. This is worse than the Nestorianism with which he charges us. The "spiritual death of Christ!" Did the author's pen not refuse to write the impiety?

† We forget; he has a text to prove this, Isaiah xiv. 13:—"I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, *in the sides of the north!*" Our readers may try to discover the proof contained in these words, that the millennium is to begin in Scotland, we cannot reach it. Antichrist boasts that he will sit in the sides of the north, *therefore* the millennium is to begin in Scotland!

‡ "When a man dies," says our author, "he has the consciousness of standing before the tribunal of Christ with the assembled humanity." Leaving our readers to understand that this has been quite *demonstrated* by our author, we ask them to read the following piece of pure vanity:—"We think we could even pass securely through an explanation of the difficulty which may be supposed to arise from the disembodied existence and consciousness of soul. But it would lead too much away from the design of this essay, and *too deeply into abstract reasoning.* We seek merely to obtain the fact. And the fact, all paradoxical as it may appear, has been obtained. Will any one disprove it? Will any one maintain the intervening of a space of time between death and judgment, between death and resurrection, in the consciousness of the departed? Then *we are prepared to show the legitimate consequences of such a position. And we think they are such as no sound Protestant theologian would like to maintain.*" (P. 129.) Notwithstanding the terror thus hung over us, we are

Digitized by Google

that Paul *knew* that the second Advent of Christ was far in the future?* What text can he adduce to show that "many an injunction is laid on the Church of the Old Testament to prepare for death?" (P. 114). What text has he to prove that Adam will be "the first that will be judged?" (P. 39.) What text can he produce to show that in this present state our attention is to be "wholly turned to the Church, and *away from the immediate view of the Lord?*" (p. 82), for such he affirms was the case with John, and his case was "an example to all ministers." This last is a most painful statement. Our eye is to be turned "away from the immediate view of the Lord!" Is it possible that a man calling himself a Christian,—a Christian minister, should have uttered so revolting a sentiment? Mr. Brown would have taught him better. Has he read Mr. B.'s book? Does he intend to write a refutation of it? Such are the *harmonies* of Post-millennial authorship! We intended to have quoted at length Mr. Brown's admirable statements as to the Lord's coming (not death), being the hope of the Church. But we fear to overstretch our limits. But it is certainly

bold enough to dissent from the author. We prefer to think with John Owen, in the last chapter of whose "Christologia" the reader will find a complete refutation of the author's dogma. As for the author himself, we may say that the person who wrote the above piece of unparalleled vanity, is not likely to care any more for Owen than for us. "It is a *pretty thing*," says our author, "*and fine food for sentimentalism*, to talk of souls recognising each other, and being spectators of what goes on in this world, and being witnesses of Christian activity in the disembodied state, . . . *but it is right to know there is no such thing, and that there is not a syllable in the Bible to support it.*" (P. 177.) We again refer our readers to Owen, selecting a sentence or two as a specimen. "Herein hath the Church that is triumphant, communion with that which is yet militant. The assembly above have not lost their concernment in the Church here below; . . they are full of affections towards their brethren, exercised with the same temptations which they have passed through. . . . Hereby there is a continuation of communion between the Church triumphant above, and that yet militant below. *That there is such a communion between glorified saints and believers in this world is an article of faith.* . . . *To suppose the Church above to be ignorant of the state of the Church here below* in general, and unconcerned in it; to be without desires of its success, deliverance, and prosperity, unto the glory of Christ, is to lay them asleep in a senseless state without the exercise of any grace or any interest in the glory of God." Where the author got the "massive theology" which he gives us to know that he possesses, we know not; it was not from John Owen. It is very plain that our author is wholly unacquainted with such writers. He speaks as if he knew everything—authors, languages, history, *pneumatology*, &c.—yet he betrays himself in almost every page. "There is not a syllable in Scripture about it," says our author. It is "an article of faith," says Owen. It is "a pretty thing, and fine food for sentimentalism," says our author. It is "such a truth," says Owen, "that to believe otherwise, would be to believe in the entire sleep of the soul." In addition to Owen, we refer our readers to Andrew Fuller, who says: "The Church above must be interested in all that is going on in the Church below." (See his "Essay on the Heavenly Glory," and his "Sermon on Jude 20.") Perhaps when the author has learned, what he evidently does not know, that the opinion he so reprobates is not only held by Owen and Fuller, but by almost all sound divines, he may moderate his tone.

* "He knew this," says our author, "both from revelation and from *his accurate perception of the philosophical question of development.*" (P. 109.)

Digitized by Google

strange to mark the *entire antagonism* between these two defenders of one system. What are we to think of a system whose defenders can hardly agree on one single argument? And which are we to listen to? Which of these books would our Post-millennial friends put into the hands of an inquirer? They must make their choice; for the one is the refutation of the other! The author challenges us to discuss the subject with him. Why does he not rather challenge Mr. Brown?

A parade of vain philosophy marks the whole book. The whole question may be settled by pneumatology! Philosophy is the first and last of the poor props on which the author leans. He does not betake himself to Scripture till philosophy has settled the question! Such is his reverence for the Word. He gives philosophy the first, and the Bible the second place in determining the question! Puffed up with the idea that he is a philosopher, metaphysician, and pneumatologist beyond other men, he utters his *dicta* with the certainty of an oracle. Throughout the book one looks in vain for anything which might mark the humility or meekness of a follower of Christ. Giving reins to his fancy, as in the case of the supposed attempt to burn Noah's ark, he says things against which sobriety and taste revolt. Making the most reckless assertions in criticism, many of which turn out to be mere assertions, without even a particle of foundation, he makes us feel that his arguments, references, quotations, &c., are open to all manner of suspicion, not merely as being feeble or inconclusive, but as devoid of truth. We don't think he means to deceive or mis-state; but his confidence in his own genius is so unbounded that he quotes at random and asserts with reckless haste, as if *his* memory could never mislead him, and as if all that *he* thinks to be true must of necessity turn out so, whether in quotation, criticism, or logic.

The spirit of the book is the most censorious as well as the most self-complacent we ever saw. The author writes as if no one were entitled to be heard upon the subject but himself. Not only does he defy all Pre-millenarians, but he sets his face with equal confidence against all the interpretations of Post-millenialists. He differs *toto cœlo* from all of them, and stands alone, having swept away every opinion, every argument, every criticism, every interpretation, but his own. The *inordinate vanity* which pervades the book might be excused if the book itself were one of which an author might be vain; but it is so incoherent in its method, so superficial in its scholarship, so thoroughly inaccurate in its statements, so glaringly incorrect in its citations from Scripture, so faulty in its hermeneutics, and so absurd in its logic, that the sounding words, and learned names, and self-congratulatory phrases occurring in every page, appear strangely incongruous and sadly unbecoming. We feel inclined to ask the author on what grounds he has been led to entertain so very high an opinion of himself, and so very low an opinion of everybody else? In giving us his misty criticism on "the resurrection of the dead," &c., he "wonders how any who are acquainted with their Greek Testament," &c., could differ from him. Now, allowing that he knows his Greek Testament

Digitized by Google

much better than *we* do, yet Olshausen knew it pretty well, and he comes to the very opposite conclusion, and tells us that "the origin of the phrase *αναστασις εκ νεκρων*, would be *inexplicable* if it were not derived from the idea that out of the mass of the *νεκροι*, some would rise first." The German critic knew his Greek Testament; and he is only one out of many first-rate critics who have come to the same conclusion, yet our interpretation is complacently called a "gratuitous assertion," and the following characteristic bit of pure vanity sums up his argument: "We fear our friends did not take their Bibles, and give the matter a proper examination before making such a statement, and building a delusive theory upon it; if they did, they are but ill-acquainted with the Greek language." (Pp. 49, 50.) We wish that Olshausen and Robert Fleming, and Joseph Mede could have been brought face to face with their depreciator. He speaks so very oracularly, however, that we are persuaded he would pay as little deference to them as to us. He would dismiss them at once with, "we need not occupy room any more. Surely it is not needful. We have the Lord, Paul, Luke, the Sadducees, the heathen philosophers, giving testimony in the matter." (P. 49.)

The author's contempt for his opponents and high thoughts of himself come out in such passages as the following:—"Until some undigested writings appeared in the present generation," &c. (P. 33.) "We undertake to prove satisfactorily that it is altogether an erroneous system." (P. 36.) "The somewhat meagre theology, which has well nigh universally accompanied their theory." *

The following is a combined estimate of himself and his opponents: "The truth is, an *earnest mind* that *grasps these things clearly* cannot help a feeling of impatience with the feminine sentimentalism about the sweetness and gentleness of 'dear Jesus,' which mingles so abundantly with the emotional in this matter." (P. 40.) The tone of the scoffer is here. We do not undertake to scan the drift of this piece of profanity. Samuel Rutherford's Letters, or Robert M'Cheyne's Sermons, can have no favour in the eyes of this writer. We wish he had given names and extracts, only we should insist upon particular references, as after the specimens we have given of his references to Scripture, we *cannot trust a single statement that he makes.*

Let us take some instances of his power of assertion. At p. 55, he says, that "the following expressions do not admit of the article before the name (Christ),—to walk with Christ, to be crucified with Christ,

* After adding "that the present is not the epoch of massive divinity;" and that "sundry elements are *more dilutive of it* than we could wish," he gives us the following description of a first-rate divine: "The eye of the *practised builder* soon detects a jutting stone, or an *unplumbed fraction* in an extensive building. Much more will a tolerably able theologian, possessed of the degree of dialectic faculty necessary to make him such, be able to detect the disjointing or disorganizing element when it intrudes into and juts out from the temple of truth." This "practised builder," this "able theologian," then goes on to make "a very few remarks," which are "well nigh sufficient to dismiss the theory itself." It is quite clear that the author regards himself as the man of massive theology. He might, at least, remember Prov. xxvii. 2.

Digitized by Google

dead with Christ, risen with Christ, to live with Christ, heirs with Christ, to be with Christ," giving us to understand that these expressions occur in the New Testament, and that the article is not prefixed. Well, let us take up our Greek Testament.

1. "To walk with Christ," is one of the expressions not to be found with the article! Why did he not add that the reason is because the expression does not occur at all! "They shall walk with me," is like it, but "with Christ" is not to be found. In Col. ii. 6, we have the nearest approach to the expression, "As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, walk in Him;" but here it is τὸν Χριστὸν, the very reverse of the rule laid down! Yet the author wishes us to take his word for it, that the expression *does occur* always without the article; whereas any mere reader of the English Testament could tell him that the words don't occur at all, and any one that can understand the mere elements of Greek would show him that when anything like the expression occurs, the article is used. Has the author any knowledge of his Greek Testament?

2. "To live with Christ," is also said to occur in the New Testament, and always without the article. This expression, like the former, does not occur in Scripture! The words "live with me," "live with Him," occur several times; but the words which the author gives as examples of his rule are not to be found! The likest expression is 1 Cor. xv. 22, "in Christ shall all be made alive," but here the article is employed! This statement of the author's is, like the former, the reverse of truth, and how he could venture on it when so sure of being detected, we do not know.

3. We are told that "dead with Christ" does not admit of the article! What then are we to make of Col. ii. 20, "If ye then be dead with Christ," σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ? This is another statement, directly contrary to fact, and how the author could have thought of making it we cannot conceive.

4. "Risen with Christ" is said to take no article. Now the literal words, "risen with Christ," occur only once, and in that one case they *do* take the article (Col. iii. 1), "If ye then be risen with Christ," τῷ Χριστῷ; and besides, "made alive with Christ," occurs elsewhere, and it takes it also! (Eph. ii. 5), συνεζωοποίησε τῷ Χριστῷ. Can the author account for a mis-statement so direct as this? Did he not know that there was such a passage as Col. iii. 1? Are mis-statements so gross and glaring compatible with the simplicity of the Christian character? At any rate, they are quite irreconcileable with any pretensions to scholarship.

5. "Joint heirs with Christ," is another expression said not to admit of the article. It occurs but once (Rom. viii. 17), but there are kindred phrases, and these take the article (Heb. iii. 14), "partakers of Christ," μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

6. It is asserted that Χριστος never has the article when used in connexion with faith (such as believe in Christ, faith in Christ), "for the believing act terminates upon the personal Redeemer." Now, granting that the *letter* of this is true, the spirit of it is quite the reverse. For

Digitized by Google

"receiving Christ" and "hoping in Him," are directed towards Christ as directly as faith,—the loving and hoping act terminate on the personal Saviour as much as the believing act,—yet the article *is* used! (Eph. i. 12); *τους προελπικοτας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* (Col. ii. 6), *ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν*. But there is something more direct (Acts xix. 4), "That they should *believe on him* who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus," *εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν*.*

7. At p. 105, we are told that "wherever the Lord speaks of his second advent, he uses a verb in the present tense; when it is referred to by creatures the verb is not in the present." This is quite incorrect. In Matt. xvi. 27, it is Christ Himself who is the speaker; yet He says, "The Son of man shall come," *μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι*, xxv. 31; "When the Son of man shall come," &c., *ὅταν ἔλθῃ*. Then on the other hand, "creatures" use the present tense (1 Thess. v. 2), "The day of the Lord so cometh," *ἐρχεται*; (Rev. i. 7), "Behold he cometh with clouds," *ἐρχεται*.

These are a few specimens of the inaccuracies and reckless misstatements with which the volume abounds. We could easily double them; but we need not. They will suffice to show the very limited amount of scholarship possessed by the author. This poverty of critical knowledge we should have abstained from dwelling on, had it not been forced on us by the childish way in which criticism is paraded in the volume as the writer's special gift and prerogative. We do not, for instance, blame him for not knowing that the expression, "Risen with Christ" *does* take the article; but we blame him for asserting, on his authority as a scholar, that it *does not*. We do not blame him for not knowing that the expressions, "Walk with Christ," and "Live with Christ," do not occur in the New Testament; but we blame him for attempting to palm them upon his readers, as New Testament expressions illustrative of his critical rules. We do not blame him for not knowing that the words, "dead with Christ," *do* take the article; but we blame him for affirming, on the strength of his extraordinary scholarship, that they *do not*. It is easy to sprinkle one's book with learned names and words of many languages, just as it would be easy for a minister who wished to display himself, to carry Greek or Hebrew volumes to the pulpit, for the astonishment of a rustic audience; but it is not so easy to become an accomplished critic. It is easy to assume the air of one who knows everything, and to take for granted that others know hardly anything; but it is not so easy to make good such an exclusive claim to universal knowledge. It is easy to challenge the orthodoxy of opponents; but it is not so easy to show that such speculations as these relating to Christ's spiritual death and first resurrection on the cross, the age of Adam's soul, &c., are within the circle of sound doctrine.

The book itself is not a dangerous one. It will not injure Pre-

* In introducing the above statements the author says, in reference to the principle on which he founds them, "We feel quite prepared to argue this with any one." His confidence in his statements and principles seems to increase in proportion to their inaccuracy and absurdity.

Digitized by Google

millennialism ; nay, we do not suppose it possible that a work like this could harm any *ism* in the world, save that one of which it happened to be the champion. The egotism, incoherency, and inaccuracy, which are its characteristics, will repel any seeker of truth ; while the improper speculations and novel expositions of Scripture will be felt by the author's friends as in no small degree burdening, entangling and discrediting their system. We were not aware that the discord among Post-millennialists was so *very* great and irreconcileable. Their antagonism towards each other on *the very passages* on which *the controversy hangs* makes it manifest that the ground on which they rest is slipping from beneath them. We are far from wishing to burden them with all the weaknesses of this book ; we believe that their estimate of it will not be so high as the author's ; but still, it is plain that they are at their wits' end to know how to prop up their theory, and each one devises a plan of his own for this end. The improper speculations of this volume may be repudiated, but may not also the question arise, What can the system be which gives rise to all these, and whose defenders are so little agreed upon a common principle that, while assailing one adversary, they do so in ways that entirely neutralize and annihilate each other ?

Le Palais de Cristal, le Precurseur de la Nouvelle Jerusalem. Par le Rev. J. L. V. Cachemaille. Guernsey. 1851.

The Anagram of the name of Cardinal Wiseman, " *Sin, War, and Malice,*" with that of the Crystal Palace, " *The Cry that all 's Peace,*" has been thought worth the notice of even literary periodicals, as remarkably descriptive of two phases of the world at this hour. Popery is working under its well-known *testudo,* "mystery," and yet the world at large is trying to say, " *Peace and safety,*" when the citadel is all but undermined, and " sin, war, and malice " ready to burst forth in the most terrific fury.

The author of this little pamphlet has been struck with the *Crystal Palace* as being, perhaps, altogether unintentionally, another sign of the last days. Many worldly persons have spoken of the charitable feelings generated by this Great Exhibition as a beginning of the Millennium,—*man's* millennium of course. But the writer remarks farther, 1. This *Crystal Palace* was meant to *produce peace.* It is the world's way of anticipating the plan of the Prince of Peace. 2. It is made of *crystal.* It is the most singular structure in the world,—quite unique,—of *crystal !* Is not this, then, a resemblance to " *New Jerusalem* " (Apoc. xxi. 18, 21), " clear as *crystal,*" "*transparent glass?* " 3. They have been bringing the glory and honour of the nations into it (Apoc. xxi. 24), anticipating New Jerusalem. 4. The Crystal Palace had its *trees,* its *fountains,* and its *throne.* (See Apoc. xxii. 1, 2.) And then, 5. It was opened by the presence of the monarch in great pomp, with music, trumpets, shoutings, and voice of multitudes, thousands on thousands ! 6. Medals and prizes are to be the result, to those who have contributed to this Industrial Exposition.

Digitized by Google

Another hint is, at the close, thrown out by the writer. He fancies that he sees a fulfilment, a special fulfilment of Malachi iii. 17, 18, in the *Evangelical Alliance*, "They that fear the Lord are speaking one to another." If so, all this tells of the day of the Lord's coming to make up his jewels as very near, even at the door. The tract is interesting and simply written.

The Expository Preacher; or, St. Matthew's Gospel Practically Expounded. Two Vols. By Charles Overton, Vicar of Cottingham.

This Exposition, by the author of that excellent work, "Cottage Lectures on the Pilgrim's Progress," is designed for the cottage and the unlearned, and especially as an assistant to that most useful class of labourers, our lay-helpers and Scripture-readers, in their visits from house to house. We must say that it appears to us exceedingly well calculated for its object. The expositions are plain, simple, practical, and earnest. A Scripture-reader provided with such a volume as the one before us, gathering round him the tenants of our cottages, or the population of our yards and alleys, could scarcely fail of sowing, by God's blessing, the seed of righteousness and truth.

The Truth of God against the Papacy; being a Course of Lectures on Popery, delivered in Edinburgh. Johnstone and Hunter. 1851.

A very full exhibition of Divine truth against Popish error. It is one of the many excellent books now issuing from the press, which the events of the last year have called forth. They are works to which we would earnestly invite the attention of our readers. For the battle is not over, nay, it is just beginning. Let us gird ourselves for the fight.

Testimony for the Times; or, Rome at the Bar of God's Word. By W. G. Rhind. London: J. K. Campbell. 1851.

Brief but clear in its statements both of truth and error. The exhibition of Gospel truth is admirable.

The Apocalypse interpreted in the Light of the Day of the Lord. By the Rev. James Kelly, M.A. Vol. II. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1851.

Though in many things we differ from Mr. Kelly, we appreciate his writings highly. They are spiritual, acute, clear, and full of vigorous thought. Out of the present volume we could make an interesting selection of passages, though in general we are very far from according with its interpretations. The reader will find in it many striking thoughts and ingenious suggestions. The close and careful comparison of Scripture with Scripture, which marks Mr. Kelly's writings, is always interesting, and often most instructive. At the

Digitized by Google

same time we cannot but express our very strong dissent from many of the expositions of this volume. Not wishing, however, to return to a former controversy, we do not enter on details.

Letters to the Right Rev. J. Hughes, Roman Catholic Bishop of New York, &c. By Kirwan. Edinburgh : Johnstone and Hunter. 1851.

These are three series of admirable Letters on the Romish controversy, by one who is entitled to speak upon it, and who speaks vigorously and well.

The Doctrine of Plenary Inspiration, and the Errors of M. Scherer, of Geneva. By Count Agenor de Gasparin. Translated by the Rev. John Montgomery, M.A. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. 1851.

Let our readers study thoroughly the question of inspiration. It will soon be forced upon the notice of the Churches, by the speculations of a false philosophy, and a lax theology. This little work is most opportune in its appearance, as well as valuable in itself. We cannot recommend it too strongly.

A Handbook for the Apocalypse. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1851.

This is not designed to be so much a book of exposition as of suggestion. Its selection and juxta-position of parallel passages is fitted to be highly useful. It is rather brief, and might safely have been doubled, without being diluted or deteriorated. We demur strongly to one of its opening suggestions, as to the "seven spirits," meaning angels. Could the apostle pray "grace and peace be with you from the angels?"

The Bulwark, or Reformation Journal. Edinburgh : J. Nichol. 1851.
The Scottish Protestant. Glasgow : W. Phun. 1851.

We most cordially recommend these two able periodicals, and most earnestly press them upon the notice of our readers.

Romanism versus *Protestantism; or, the inevitable Result of the present Crisis in the World's History.* Part I. The Chart. London: W. and T. Piper. 1851.

This Chart is cleverly sketched, but very objectionable. Truth crucified between the two thieves of Popery and Protestantism, may be said to be the substance and drift of the sketch. It seems the production of an Irvingite, though no name is given.

Digitized by Google

A Contribution towards an Argument for the Plenary Inspiration of Scripture, derived from the minute Historical Accuracy of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, as proved by certain Egyptian and Assyrian Remains, preserved in the British Museum. By ARACHNOPHILUS. London: S. Bagster and Sons. 1851.

OUR only objection to this pamphlet is its brevity. Why did not our excellent friend enlarge it? It tantalizes one as much as it interests. Nevertheless, our readers will find it a most valuable contribution towards the great argument, and an interesting statement of facts not fully known or appreciated.

The Apocalypse popularly explained. London: Wertheim and Macintosh. 1851.

THIS is a reprint of part of Mr. Irving's "Babylon and Infidelity foredoomed" (though the Editor does not say so). Whether our readers agree with its interpretations or not, they will find in it a description of Popery and Infidelity, with their several dooms, such as no pen but Irving's could have given.

Faith Triumphant; or, the World Overcome. By JOSEPH ELISHA FREEMAN. London: Ward and Co.

A FAITHFUL message from a watchman's pen. It is not prophetical, yet, seeing it has come in our way, we commend it for its general excellence.

The Workman's Testimony to the Sabbath, &c. Johnstone and Hunter. 1851.

AN excellent reprint of three of the Sabbath Essays. We trust that the subject of the Sabbath is drawing more and more attention from Christians, and all the more that not only the world hates it, but some Christian men look on its observance as a continuation of Sinaitic bondage. If their view be correct, the Sabbath must, in itself, be a curse and not a blessing, an evil and not a good. It is sad to observe that, while some set aside the Sabbath on the plea that every day should be a Sabbath, they do not act on their principles; but, instead of bringing up every day to the level of the Sabbath, they bring down the Sabbath to the level of a common day.

The Chronology of Creation or Geology, and Scripture reconciled. By THOMAS HUTTON, F.G.S., Captain, Bengal Army. Calcutta. 1850.

THE reader, while perhaps dissenting from some of the author's statements, will find this an able, interesting, and well-written volume. We wish that we could enter on it more fully; but our limited space forbids. It does not wholly accord with the views maintained in the second article in our present number, but still the writer's views and arguments are worthy of consideration.

Digitized by Google

The Psalms, translated and explained. By J. A. Alexander. Three Vols. New York: Baker and Scribner. 1851.

As a critical work, this book will be found valuable. It is chiefly, indeed, a digest of Hengstenberg, but still it contains much that will be useful to the student of the Psalms. In so far, however, as the prophetical aspect of the Psalms is concerned, it is silent. Hence it is only in a limited measure that it will be found of service.

Seven Cries from the Cross. A Course of Lectures, by S. J. Gambier, M.A. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1851.

These Lectures are very spiritual in tone, and clear in style. They are fitted to be useful.

Sketches of Modern Irreligion and Infidelity, with some Results of late extensive Travels on the Continent, &c. By the Rev. Buchan W. Wright, M.A. London: Seeleys. 1851.

An able and vigorously written work—well worthy of the careful study of our readers. Towards the close the author thus refers to the hopes of the Church, as to the Lord's coming and reign:—"It was not until the Bishop of Rome began to claim supremacy, and by sitting as a priest upon his kingly throne, endeavoured to antedate the glories of the true Melchizedec, that different views began to prevail; for among the best of Christians, for 250 years, it passed current for a tradition apostolical, and as such is delivered by many fathers of the second and third centuries. But ever since apostasy became regnant and imperial, the second advent of Christ, to put down Satanic power, and accomplish the restitution of all things, for which St. Peter longed and hasted, has dwindled away into a mere abstraction. It is to this great effulgent promise of Scripture that the Church has been directed to look forward with expectant hope, the day and hour of its manifestation being purposely veiled in obscurity, in order to promote vigilance and spiritual preparation in all ages."

Halcyonia Ecclesiarum Evangelicarum; sive de Regno Christi glorioso in Terris, ubi aperitur Mysterium Regni mille Annorum. Authore: Andrea Rallio. Genevae. 1659.

We merely give the title of the above curious old work, in order to let our readers know of the existence of it, as it is very scarce and almost unknown. We may possibly return to it and give some extracts. The author seems to think that it will be a providential advent (if we may call it so), and not *the* second advent that will introduce the Millennium; nevertheless he holds the literality of the first resurrection, and one or two other points held by Pre-millennialists.

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

A Correspondent from Guernsey asks of us the authority on which we made the statement in vol. ii., pp. 97, 98, as to the tenet held by some, that the failure of the Church in primitive days caused it to be so set aside, that the Epistles addressed to her are not to be used by us in our attempts to form churches. Our authority was an anonymous tract of sixteen pages, with the title "On the present Ruin of the Church," originally written in French,—a tract full of crudity and incoherent assertion, and maintaining throughout the principle stated above. We have no room to quote at large, but there are in it such sentences as these: "The re-establishment of the dispensation on its ancient footing . . . . is positively and judicially determined by our Lord in the negative." To attempt to re-construct the Church, after the model of primitive days, is said to arise from "pride, and slighting the instruction of the Word." (P. 15.) Again, "the moment the things that are (the seven Churches) are closed, the prophet is taken up into heaven, and what follows is *not a recognised Church, but the providence of God in the world.*" (P. 16.) And again: "*A return from the evil* which exists to *what God originally ordered,* is not always a proof of having understood his word and will." (P. 5.) In our statement formerly made, we need not have specified the Epistles to the Corinthians, we ought to have said, "Every epistle, and every word in which there is anything relating to the construction or discipline of the early Church." For the principles of that tract are of the most sweeping kind, setting aside the whole New Testament, save the one text, "where two or three are gathered," &c. What authority the writer has for making that text an exception, we know not. His principles would sweep away every word which has been written for the guidance of the Church, and allow every one to do that which is right in his own eyes. And all because the writer thinks that "the dispensation has failed," and is "in a state of ruin!" (P. 7.) We write as men that reverence the Word of God, and we ask, where is such an expression to be found as a "dispensation that has failed," a "dispensation in ruins?" They who use such words are departing most sadly from the language of Scripture, and yet on such words they construct theories, which set aside Apostolic precept, and which, by a slight extension, will set aside Apostolic doctrine.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN VIEWS COMPARED.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

63, *Frederick-street, Edinburgh, May,* 1851.

Dear Sir,—Some time ago I promised to write an article for your Journal, and mentioned as the subject, An examination or comparison of the views on Prophecy held by the American "Adventists," with those of British "Pre-millennialists. And as my views, I believe, do not, on some points, coincide with

Digitized by Google

those maintained in the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy," I subscribe my name, as I have no wish to implicate any one in the consequences of views they do not hold.

The American Adventists differ from English Pre-millennialists on some very important points; and as, in my view, they appear far more united among themselves, and seemingly more actuated by Christian principles with regard to the work to be done, and the doing of it, than we appear to be; their views, which in this country have been treated with too much contempt and neglect, are deserving of all respect and consideration.

They act like men in earnest, and fully persuaded in their own minds; they believe us in error on many points, and have given us their reasons for so believing; but so far as I have seen, they have never been responded to by us, which they ought to have been, either in one way or another. We are bound to believe them ready to bow to Scriptural proof where we think them in error, and we ought to be ready to render reasons and proofs for the views we hold, or to renounce these, if they can disprove them. Both parties are agreed as to principles of interpretation, I think, and also upon the fundamental article of the pre-millennial advent and resurrection of all the saints, and personal presence and glorious millennial reign of Christ and his saints. We need say little about those points on which we are agreed, but on those where we hold opposite views, either they or we are certainly wrong, and I suppose it will be granted that the party in error can be proved to be so; in other words, that important doctrines of God's revealed purposes can be evinced by Scripture proofs.

Let us then compare our views and progress in the study of prophecy with those of our American brethren, who have devoted much time and pains to the investigation; and where we differ from them, let us endeavour to test the points of difference by the Word of God.

They deny, first, that there will be men in the flesh; second, any probation; and third, any births, marriages, or deaths, during the Millennium.

Neither they nor we have any pretensions to infallibility; and I suppose either party ready to confess our error when we see it fairly proved. I confess I have seen no proof on the American side, of these questions; but I think I see something very like Scriptural proof of the truth of the opposite views. To the law and to the testimony, then, for proof of the points at issue. What saith the Scripture? When God speaketh, let man listen, learn, and obey.

The Americans say, there will be no births or marriages, no men in the flesh, or in a state of probation, during the Millennium. In the article of death I agree with them that there will be no death in the Millennium, death being swallowed up in victory at the beginning of it, and both John and Isaiah, as I understand them, distinctly declare that "there shall be no more death." John and Isaiah, no doubt, are in harmony with each other, and they describe the new heavens and new earth, which we are agreed is the scene of Christ's millennial kingdom. For many years I had understood Isaiah lxv. 20, as teaching that in that new earth, there should be both marriages, births, sin, and death. For more than seven years, however, I have been convinced that the meaning of Isaiah is the same as that of John, who distinctly declares "there shall be no more death" in that renewed state.

As, however, the words seem to declare the opposite, let us consider them with the context, ver. 20, "There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days, for the child shall die an hundred years' old, but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed." Ver. 22, "They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth (children) for trouble, for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord and their offspring with them."

These verses seem to affirm births, and consequently marriages, and also sin and death, during the same period. In so far as death is concerned, it seems directly contrary to the declaration of John, "There shall be no more death." He does not say, however, that there shall be no more births, which would settle the meaning of verse 22, "They shall not bring forth children for

Digitized by Google

trouble," to mean, they shall never bring forth more children, "for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them." This offspring is born before or during the Millennium. If born before the Millennium, then they are all in their glorified bodies, and there would be no need to speak of bringing forth children among those, for among them there is "no marrying nor giving in marriage." If born during the Millennium, as the verse seems to state, then they, though still in renewed natures and bodies (for all things are made new), are blessed and holy, as Adam was before he fell.

Fallen man is born to trouble, sin, and death, "Man that is born of woman is of few days and full of trouble." (Job xiv. 1.) That has been the state of man since the fall, and will certainly continue to be so till man is delivered from the sentence pronounced against him for sin. When the sentence of death is annulled at the first resurrection, and renewal of all things at the beginning of the Millennium, then it would seem both unreasonable and unscriptural that any more sin or trouble should be permitted to prevail in the new earth. And there seem few notices of anything of the kind during the Millennium, till the apostasy after it, when Satan is let loose, and deceives the nations Gog and Magog.

In the Millennium, "sucking children," weaned children, and "little children," are spoken of, who are either born during the Millennium or before it. If they were born before it, then they had died in infancy, and are raised in glorified bodies of the same age as they died. If they are to be born during the Millennium, then there is no limit apparently set to an endless increase, and it is argued that the earth would soon be overwhelmed by the innumerable multitudes. This argument, however, is not good, for there may be a limit to the increase which God has not made known; and whether or not, if it is a scriptural truth, that children shall be born during that period, we have no right to create difficulties where there are none with God.

Before the fall all things were very good in the sight of God. Since then, the creatures were made subject to vanity, and do not appear to have answered the ends for which they were originally created. No doubt these ends will be all answered when, in the restitution of all things, the creature, yea, all groaning creation, shall be delivered from vanity and the bondage of corruption, into the "glorious liberty of the children of God." (Rom. viii.) Such seems to be the described condition of the new earth when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. Then all the creatures which were brought under the curse through man's sin appear restored to primeval peace and harmony. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Isa. xi. 6—9.)

The Americans, as well as we, profess to bow to the teaching of Scripture, and to receive it in the plain, common sense, obvious meaning of the words. There can be no doubt that the state here described is the renewed creation, the new heavens and new earth, as also described in chap. lxv., and in Rev. xxi. Creation and the creatures delivered from the bondage of corruption and curse of sin, into the "glorious liberty of the sons of God." (Rom. viii.) Here is a state of things upon earth, such as never was before—a state of holiness, happiness, and peace, in which "God himself shall dwell with men, and there shall be no more death, sorrow, nor pain." Here men "shall build houses, and inhabit them, plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them, and shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth children for trouble." If words have any meaning, the animal creation also are restored to original perfection, and procreate their species in peace and harmony. I am not aware of any one believing in the

Digitized by Google

resurrection of animals, and taking for granted that our American brethren do not, here they have the cow and the bear, and *their young ones*, lying down together, and a little child leading the lion and the ox. There seems no obscurity or doubt about the lower creation still producing their kind in that description, and there is nothing said to make us believe that "the sucking child," "the weaned and the little children," are not all born in that perfect and happy state of restored creation also. These children are either in glorified resurrection bodies, or born in the restored state of creation, in restored and unfallen natures. They have familiar command of the lower creatures, which do them ready service; and these creatures are still generating their kind. Is man alone of all creatures the only one not restored? Is he alone in the regeneration of all things (παλιγγενεσια), still fallen, unrestored, and unproductive? Or is the increase of the human race arrested for ever, while the races of animals are multiplying and increasing? And are glorified children to have familiar command of the restored creatures, while the raised saints are to build houses for themselves, and plant gardens and live on the produce, as if they still were earning their food by the sweat of their brow? It is certain that the changed and glorified saints "shall neither marry nor be given in marriage;" and I am not sure that we are ever told that they shall build houses and plant vineyards to live upon the produce; but this is certain, that as they do not marry, it would be superfluous to tell us that "they shall not bring forth children for trouble."

Of whom then can that sentence be written? Certainly not of fallen, unrenewed, or unrestored men; for there are none in that unrestored or fallen state, for "all things are made new;" and these are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them. If it does not apply to glorified saints, it can apply to none else than that portion of the human race which was left after the saints were changed, and the wicked destroyed at the coming of the Lord.

It may be asked where I find such in the Bible? In the account of the general desolation of the earth at the last outpouring of wrath before the Lord appeareth to reign in glory in Mount Zion and Jerusalem, we are told that the inhabitants of the earth are burned, but still a "*few men are left*," who may be those that are called to "glorify the Lord in the fires;" or who "hide themselves for a little moment in their chambers, till the indignation be overpast" (Isa. xxvi. 20); at the time when "the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity;" or at the second advent and "day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." The righteous are all changed and caught up to meet the Lord; the wicked are all after that destroyed, but still a "few men are left," who are neither caught up nor destroyed, but who, when God's judgments are upon the earth, appear to "learn righteousness," and are spared, and no doubt restored, in the palingenesia, or restitution of all things, to original perfection, like the rest of groaning creation.

Those who go up from year to year to Jerusalem, to worship the King the Lord of hosts, are not glorified saints, for there is notice of a possible neglect to go up, and a want of rain to refresh the earth for them is sent as a punishment; "And if the family of Egypt go not and come not, which have no rain, there shall be the plague, wherewith the Lord will smite the nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles." (Zech. xii.) Who will say that these nations and families are glorified saints? And if they are not, who, and in what condition are they? It is evident they are fallible men, and may fall away and be deceived, as Adam was. In the millennial kingdom, of which this is a description, all things are restored and made new, as we have seen in the animal creation; and is man alone of all, not also renewed, but only the saints glorified, and the rest destroyed? All the wicked are destroyed—all the tares, or wicked, and everything that offendeth and worketh iniquity, is gathered out, and all that remains is renewed, restored, made new, and not to be called sinful, cursed, or hypocrites, any more than unfallen Adam in paradise was.

Digitized by Google

If those "few men left"—these "left of all the nations that came against Jerusalem"—are neither glorified saints, nor cut off in the day of judgment and perdition of the ungodly men who know not God nor obey the Gospel, they must remain to be included in the restitution of all things; and although they are not the glorious saints in whom the Lord comes to be glorified, are they not evidently the others mentioned, namely, "and to be admired in all them that believe in that day?" (2 Thess. i. 6—10.) For besides the glorified saints, Paul evidently describes others not so glorified, by whom Christ shall be believed in and admired in that day, who appear just to be "the remnant" or "few men left" after the translation of the saints and the destruction of the wicked.

If such be the truth, as it seems to be, then, though the "glorified saints neither marry nor are given in marriage," yet these left and restored ones, who had not attained to the resurrection or change of glorified saints, appear to be the inhabitants of the new earth, who shall build houses, and plant vineyards, and "who shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth children for trouble, for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them."

After the destruction of the ungodly at the coming of the Lord, and when all workers of iniquity, and everything that offendeth is gathered out, and all things are made new, it is evident that no hypocrites or secret rebels remain to be put down; and the nations, Gog and Magog, if in existence, which are after the thousand years deceived by Satan, form no exception, for the whole earth is full of the knowledge of the Lord. I can see no Scripture warrant for looking upon these nations as fallen or sinful nations during the Millennium, or till they are deceived by Satan after he is let loose, any more than we would be warranted in speaking of Adam as a sinner before he fell. The fact of their being deceived by Satan proves them to have been in a state of probation, or fallible at the time, if they are men.

But the American Adventists deny that the nations, Gog and Magog, are nations upon earth during any part of the Millennium. They maintain them to be the wicked dead of all ages and nations from the beginning, raised from the dead at the end of a thousand years, but give no proof, that I have seen, for that assumption. They assert that "the fact that the devil is shut up in the abyss that he should not deceive the nations," no more proves these nations to be in probation, than the fact that "God wipes all tears from the eyes of his people," proves that they would cry if he did not, &c.

Before the American argument can be conclusive, they must prove that the nations, Gog and Magog, shall be raised from the dead, or that there are no nations upon the earth during the Millennium that can be deceived after Satan is loosed. The very reason given for binding Satan during the Millennium is, that he may not deceive the nations during that time. No one imagines that he could deceive the glorified saints even were he loosed all that time, and of course "the rest of the dead" are not raised, and consequently could not be deceived or wrought upon, even were he at liberty during the Millennium. There are, therefore, other nations which could be deceived were Satan loose, and which shall be deceived after he is loosed, different from glorified saints, and from the wicked dead. Who are these nations, and where are they, and in what state during the Millennium? The Americans deny the existence upon earth of any but glorified saints, which of course cannot be deceived. They appear to take no account of "the left of the nations," which go up to Jerusalem year by year to "worship the King, the Lord of Hosts," and which appear to neglect that duty and to be punished for it. They overlook entirely those along with the glorified saints, "who shall believe in that day, and in whom Christ shall be admired." (2 Thess. i. 8—10.) They deny that the inhabitants of that new earth, who shall build and plant gardens, and subsist on the produce of them, and who "shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth children for trouble," are other than the glorified saints, of whom, so far as I know, we do not read of doing anything of that kind. Before they assumed Gog and Magog to be "the rest of the dead," they should have seen these dead raised, for Gog and Magog are deceived and

Digitized by Google

destroyed by fire from God out of heaven, before the account of the resurrection of the "rest of the dead" is given. Again, what propriety or purpose is there in showing Satan to again deceive the wicked dead whom he had before the Millennium deceived to their eternal ruin? This is something like a slaying again of the slain. But what are these nations, Gog and Magog? Who so likely as those nations that neglect their privileges and duty, and do not go up to Jerusalem to worship the King, Jehovah Jesus, reigning there in glory? When Satan is loosed, who are so likely to be deceived as these? But we find no account of their being deceived till then, and as all things were restored in the restitution, we cannot look upon them as still unrenewed, unregenerate, and fallen men, but like Adam, holy and happy, but fallible, and that shall fall away when yielding to the seductions of the deceiver.

If I am wrong, my errors surely can be proved, and then I am ready to renounce them. I am, &c.,

James Scott.

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Dear Sir,—The accompanying paper, on the probable creation-place of angels, was written by me, with very little variation, about three years ago. I mention this circumstance, because I find that Mr. Faber has brought out much the same arguments in a work lately published, but which as yet I have not seen; and did I not make this statement, it might be supposed that my argument had been borrowed from him. When stating these views to a friend, at the time to which I refer, he informed me, that it was an old Rabbinical idea.

I remain, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

November 21, 1851. ————

The probable Creation-place of Angels.

The discoveries of modern geologists have proved a stone of stumbling in the way of some, and to others, for a season, an occasion of sceptical triumph; any suggestions, therefore, which may tend, by God's blessing, to remove the one, and to check the other, claim attention at the least from the Christian. That this our planet was the creation-place of angels, has been an idea long prevailing in my mind,—occupied by them, in a condition of blessedness, the natural accompaniment of dwelling in peace with God, until a portion fell; at which time, those who kept their first principality, were admitted to the third heaven, and made partakers of the beatific vision; whereas, those who sinned, were cast down to hell (then "prepared for the devil and his angels"), and "delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." (2 Pet. ii. 4.) This earth also, according to this belief the previous habitation of the whole company, was then visited with judgment [analogous to the course of Divine dealing in the after case of man's rebellion, when, because of his sin, the earth which he occupied, and the subordinate creation, or "creature," was cursed for his sake]; and in this state, (I mean lying under the effects of the former malediction for the sin of angels,) I conceive that it was found, when those acts took place, which are recorded by Moses in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis.

The object of this paper is to examine the soundness of this theory; to endeavour to ascertain what supports are drawn from the Scripture, and whether it tends to solve any of those difficulties, which are confessedly found in the existing state of things. May the Spirit of wisdom be our guide in this research!

That the present revealed privilege of angels, of seeing "the face of our Father which is in heaven," in other words, of enjoying "the beatific vision," was not that to which they were originally admitted, I believe to be no new idea; because it was argued by those who entertained it, had it been so, they would have been

Digitized by Google

placed beyond the possibility of falling, inasmuch as in his presence there "is fulness of joy." If this be true, a further analogy is found in the Divine dealings with the two divisions of his intelligent creation, namely, that each should pass through a condition of probation, before admitted to the high privilege of dwelling in the presence of God. Hence, some other place was considered to be their creation-place; and hence it has been said by some of old time, that "they were created for some lower heaven." True it is that this suggestion may in part remove the difficulty which surrounds this question, but, except some scriptural intimation to that effect be found, it amounts to nothing more than a conjecture. The prime question, therefore, for our consideration is, whether anything be revealed in the sacred Scripture to justify the theory which we have advanced.

Amongst the arguments which have been raised against the truth of the Mosaic history of creation, and by consequence of Divine revelation, from the discoveries of modern geologists in the crust of our earth, we meet with these,—that there are indubitable evidences of our planet having existed for a much longer period than 6000 years; certain formations in the earth's crust, as well as fossil remains of animals of a higher date being found to exist. That, moreover, as in one class of such fossil remains there are no remains of man to be found, the principle, so commonly received by Christians, that *as by sin came death into the world*, is at once disproved, inasmuch as, long before the creation of man upon the earth, death had reigned, and that to a vast extent.

Upon the whole class of such objections as these, one preliminary remark may be made; that if these professed discoveries of modern science be true, they will sooner or later, in some way or other, be found to harmonize with the Scriptures of truth, for it is impossible that truth can be opposed to itself. As it respects the first of these geological inferences, that the crust of our earth exhibits internal evidence of a far greater age than that which has been assigned to it by believers in the Divine revelation, it appears to me that a sufficient answer has been given to it, by taking the opening words of Scripture, as the introduction to what was about to be recorded. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." At some period in the bygone eternity, this act of creation took place. "And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." Such was its state, when the Spirit of God brooded upon the face of the waters, and the first act of renovation was performed; "and God said, Let there be light, and there was light." Hence, the supposed limitation to 6000 years for its existence ceases; and though once "an infant of days," when "in the beginning" God created it, any periods of unlimited extent may have passed over it in the annals of its previous story.

But, in this very opening of the Divine record, I meet with an intimation that a part at least of my theory may be correct.

In Gen. i. 2, the word translated "was" (upon the authority of no mean scholar), may and ought to be translated "became;" "the earth became desolation and emptiness." It is so translated about twenty-five times in this very chapter, if we consult the Vulgate. Thus ver. 3: "Fiat lux, et facta est lux; factumque est vespere et mane." Ver. 6: "Fiat firmamentum." Ver. 14: "Fiant luminaria," &c. Gen. iii. 22: "The man is become as one of us;" xix. 26; "And she *became* a pillar of salt."* This being so, viz., that God at some season having created the heavens and the earth, and the earth at some time after this act *becoming* desolation and emptiness, must have been in a previous condition very different from this, between the period of its creation, and that when it "became desolation and emptiness;" by a fair and reasonable conclusion, the very opposite of both, smiling with all the beauty of God's works, and filled with the living creatures of his hand. In proceeding with the sacred narrative, we meet with another word in our authorized version, which, had it

* It should here be observed, that all Hebrew scholars are not agreed upon this point.

Digitized by Google

been correct in conveying the force of the original, would have strengthened our case, I mean, Gen. i. 28, the word "replenish." This, however, does not mean fill again, but simply "fill ye."

Other circumstances connected with the sacred history, assist us further in our inquiry.

This planet appears to comprise within it the place of punishment "prepared for the devil and his angels," and which place has enlarged her mouth to make room for the accession of the hosts of ungodly men;* thus proving the accuracy of the term employed of sending them *down* to hell. Whilst this brings with it the difficulty of reconciling those passages of holy writ, which speak of the fallen host being delivered into chains of darkness, whilst others speak as clearly of a multitude being at liberty to go to and fro in the earth, and to walk up and down in it, under Satan, "the god of this world," "the prince of the power of the air," and that this liberty will extend until the time predicted by our Lord, Apoc. xx. 2; yet it at once explains how Satan came to be upon this planet, when God, having fitted it up anew, created man in his own image, the last and the crowning work of all, and placed upon his brow the diadem of a righteous rule over all that he had created and made.

But the Scriptures record a course of conduct pursued by Satan (including necessarily, I conceive, the fallen hosts of which he was the head), which exhibits a feeling of enmity against the new creature, unprovoked on his part, save only that he reflected the image of God, the result of which proved that he was bent upon bringing man down from his principality, to his own fallen level of disobedience. Our theory explains it all. He had once occupied man's place on this our planet, in a previous condition of holiness and of peace with God, but now being in a state of enmity, the spirit which was in him lusted to envy, and he could not abide that another should occupy it, and should experience in his person all that love and favour in which himself had basked, when, as "Son of the morning," he had dwelt in the light of God's countenance, but all of which he had slighted, and having slighted had forfeited, and not only forfeited for ever, but had exchanged for "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," in all the forthcoming eternity.

But if the conduct of Satan against man, be thus the more readily explained, I think that I discover in this a reasonable solution of the feelings manifested by the angels of light to which reference is beautifully made by Job (xxxviii. 7). If that passage refer to the work recorded by Moses, and not to the previous original creation work, why, I ask, should the morning stars sing together, and all the sons of God shout for joy? Was it simply at beholding God's beautiful handiwork in this single act of creative energy (I say, single, with reference to this planet as a whole), forming a part only, and a minute part, moreover, of his operations in the surrounding expanse, in which, as the Lord God of Sabaoth, he has revelled in creation work? Look at it, however, by this light, and how readily can we sympathise with their feeling, the feeling which called forth such acclamations of holy joy! If, as I suppose, the sin of angels had brought wreck and ruin upon this planet, and all that had previously inhabited it; if the ban of divine displeasure had been uttered against it, and the curse of God had swept over all its fair face, and visited its secret chambers, and extinguished the lamp of life, which till then had animated it, and made it a desolation, and marred its beauty, and deranged its symmetry, and, as a hateful thing in his sight, veiled it with an incrustation of desolation, yea, covered it with the garment of darkness, and had doomed it to be the eternal prison-house of fallen spirits, that there it should stand an object of abhorring to all holy created intelligences,—what must have been the joy of that innumerable company when they beheld the withdrawal of the shrouded canopy—when they saw with wonder the generating Spirit brooding over it—when they heard the voice of God pronouncing, "Let there be light, and light was," and darkness fled away at his bidding—when the ban was taken off, and the once forsaken desolation

* See Is. lxvi. 24; Mark ix. 44, 46, 48.

Digitized by Google

became the very garden of God, teeming with the creatures of his power, the witnesses of his returning love; so that once again it should take its place amongst the shining wonders of his hand, and should be found responsive to his call, when He "who telleth the number of the stars, and calleth them all by their names," passed through the muster roll of his creation. Well might the morning stars sing together, and all the sons of God shout for joy! Well might their armies rejoice and sing, when the desolation of bye-gone ages, which the offence of their compeers had provoked, was finished, and in its place was substituted a fresh outpouring from the unfathomable depths of Divine love.

But a more important service is rendered to the cause of truth, should our theory prove correct, in furnishing a triumphant confirmation of the doctrine, That by sin only came death into the world. Does the geologist tell us of the result of his researches, and drawing out from the recesses of our earth the relics of an earlier world, does he point to those in which no fossil remnant of human kind is discoverable; and then with an air of triumph pronounce, That our doctrine is naught? Does he ask us to consider these things, and adds, "Here is death before man's creation, here, therefore, is death before sin existed?" And what is our reply? We demur to his conclusion, and we tell him, That if, as we believe, this earth was the dwelling-place of angels before they sinned, we believe that there was a garniture of material beauty, and of life and loveliness around them, fitting it for the seat of intelligent beings of the highest order, who, like ourselves, might read in all around the eternal power, love, and Godhead of the Great I AM; that, so long as God's will was done, so long blessings abounded, and life and joyousness and peace characterized that state. But, so soon as sin entered into those ranks, and "Lucifer, son of the morning," rebelled against God, not only do we know that "God spared not the angels that sinned," but, we conceive, that He smote with desolation and death their dwelling-place, and that *thus the reign of death commenced as the wages of sin*, in those ages which philosophers teach have rolled over our earth before, as they affirm, man was called into being.

It may be observed, in conclusion, that as there is a keeping and symmetry in all the works of God, so in the present case we perceive an intimation of the same, for amongst the fossil remains of former ages which have been brought to light there appears to have been *a larger proportion* of remains of gigantic dimensions than are found amongst the living tribes which now occupy the earth or sea, so much so that the word μεγα is used as a common prefix to their names. Now, when we recollect that in the Divinely inspired description of angels we read, that they excel in strength, we find the symmetry or keeping in the work of God, of which I have spoken.

A STRANGER HERE.

"And truly, if they had been mindful of that country whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned; but now they desire a better, that is, an heavenly country."—Heb. xi. 14.

I.

I MISS the dear paternal dwelling,
Which mem'ry still undimm'd recals,
A thousand early stories telling,
I miss the venerable walls.

II.

I miss the chamber of my childhood,
I miss the shade of boyhood's tree,—
The glen, the path, the cliff, the wild-wood,
The music of the well-known sea.

Digitized by Google

III.

I miss the ivied haunt of moonlight,
  I miss the forest and the stream,
I miss the fragrant grove of noonlight,
  I miss our mountain's sunset gleam.

IV.

I miss the green slope, where reposing
  I mused upon the near and far,
Marked, one by one, each floweret closing,
  Watched, one by one, each opening star.

V.

I miss the well-remembered faces,
  The voices, forms of fresher days;
Time ploughs not up these deep-drawn traces,
  These lines no ages can erase.

VI.

I miss them all, for, unforgetting,
  My spirit o'er the past still strays,
And, much its wasted years regretting,
  It treads again these shaded ways.

VII.

I mourn not that each early token
  Is now to me a faded flower,
Nor that the magic snare is broken
  That held me with its mystic power.

VIII.

I murmur not that now a stranger,
  I pass along the smiling earth;
I know the snare, I dread the danger,
  I hate the haunts, I shun the mirth.

IX.

My hopes are passing upward, onward,
  And with my hopes my heart has gone;
My eye is turning skyward, sunward,
  Where glory brightens round yon throne.

X.

My spirit seeks its dwelling yonder;
  And faith fore-dates the joyful day
When these old skies shall cease to sunder
  The one dear, love-linked family.

XI.

Well-pleased I find years rolling o'er me,
  And hear each day time's measured tread;
Far fewer clouds now stretch before me,
  Behind me is the darkness spread.

XII.

And summer's suns are swiftly setting,
  And life moves downward in their train,
And autumn dews are fondly wetting
  The faded cheek of earth in vain.

Digitized by Google

XIII.

December moons are coldly waning,
And life with them is on the wane;
Storm-laden skies with sad complaining,
Bend blackly o'er the unsmiling main.

XIV.

My future from my past unlinking,
Each dying year untwines the spell;
The visible is swiftly sinking,
Uprises the invisible.

XV.

To light, unchanging, and eternal,
From mists that sadden this bleak waste,
To scenes that smile for ever vernal,
From winter's blackening leaf I haste.

XVI.

Earth, what a sorrow lies before thee,
None like it in the shadowy past;—
The sharpest throe that ever tore thee,
Even tho' the briefest and the last!

XVII.

I see the fair moon veil her lustre,
I see the sackcloth of the sun;
The shrouding of each starry cluster,
The three-fold woe of earth begun.

XVIII.

I see the shadows of its sunset;
And wrapt in these the Avenger's form;
I see the Armageddon-onset;—
But I shall be above the storm.

XIX.

There comes the moaning and the sighing,
There comes the hot tear's heavy fall,
The thousand agonies of dying;—
But I shall be beyond them all.

NOTICE.

All readers of the Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced; also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New Street, London.

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

APRIL, 1852.

Art. I.—IS ROME THE BABYLON OF THE APOCALYPSE?

Part II.

Our former article concluded with a brief reference to Basilides. Before entering upon the history of that arch-heretic it is necessary to consider for ourselves the state of mankind at the period in which he lived. There exist great errors upon this subject, and good men have taken the forgeries of fanatical friars and indorsed them by their names as indisputable facts.

The civilized world then, in the second century, was separated, as from the days of Julius Cæsar till now, into four divisions, alienated by difference of origin, of language, of religion, and of moral character. Of these the first and most ancient was the Persian Empire, then including Affghanistan, Tartary, with Northern India, and restored under its native sovereigns in renewed magnificence. Ruled by a dark-eyed, but white-complexioned aristocracy, combining the mingled blood of Shem and Japheth, it was flushed with invariable victory over the Romans in war. The ruling castes worshipped a Good, an Evil, and an Intermediate Spirit dwelling in the sun. They sternly prescribed image worship, and above all, that of the queen of heaven. As warriors ruling by the sword a conquered population, they despised the contemplative and contemned the ascetic life. But they governed a vast and a mingled people. In Iran there were many races, and whilst the dark Hindoo submitted outwardly to the will of his conqueror, and the yellow Tartar chafed against his yoke, the conquered tribes clung secretly to the creeds of Brahma or of Boodh. The Khoord population

Digitized by Google

again, occupying the Assyrian range, inaccessible for horse, remained unmolested, unconquered, and practically independent. There the fearful mysteries of Cybele and Mithra were retained, their rites kept up, their magical knowledge transmitted, and sacrifices offered to Satan and the Queen of Heaven; to the Queen of Heaven the unbloody sacrifice of the unleavened wafer, to Satan the bloody sacrifice of the crucified and quartered man. Occupying a position which commanded all the passes into the empires, the Persian shrank from forcing them into rebellion, the Roman from assailing and thus driving them into alliance with their Persian masters. From their Mesopotamian hills there ran several chains of mountains through the Greek territory, the Taurus, Lebanon, the hills of Engaddi, and others, all more or less inhabited then, as now, by the same fierce race, with whom, although nominally under Greek government, the Roman military authorities rarely meddled. Physically they appear a mixed race, combining the two great families of Japheth and Ham, intermarried in the west, with a mixed race of apostate Hebrews. Through the hills the worship of Semiramis remained the national faith, and at Antioch, at Emesa, and at Mount Carmel, were the three great seats of her worship. And through the hills of Lebanon, and Koordistan, we still have the Ansayrii, Druse, and Ismaylian worshippers of the female principle.

Next to Persia stood the Greek Empire, comprehending precisely the same territories as the Turkish Power now,* differing only from it in being garrisoned by Sclavonians instead of Turks, having few points in common with the Roman or with its Persian neighbours. We are apt to fancy Greece as forming part of the *Roman* Empire. This is a mistake. The Macedonian and Roman Empires were for three centuries governed by the same military, but not by the same civil or ecclesiastical administration. The Pontiff of Rome had no more authority over Greeks or in Greece than the Archbishop of Canterbury over the Seven Islands. In fact, Greece stood in precisely the same relation to Rome as Corfu now to Great Britain. No Greek, unless naturalized, could hold office in the Roman territories. No Roman, unless naturalized, could claim the privileges of a Greek citizen, or be Primate of a Greek municipality. When Perseus was defeated by the Romans, they, by proclamation at the

* This difference is more apparent than real, the effective part of the Turkish army still consisting wholly of Sclavonians, retaining the ancient kilted costume of Alexander, and the silver ornaments of Argyraspides.

Digitized by Google

Isthmian Games, guaranteed to the Greeks their civil, ecclesiastical, and religious liberties, nor did they ever break the pledge. A distinct Cabinet and distinct officials carried on the Government of Greece, Asia, Syria, and Egypt. No attempt was made to alter or approximate the language, the laws, or the social customs, which still remained, as we have before observed, as disunited from the Roman as the Corfiote from the English. Nor did the races become more friendly. A Roman settling in Greece was still liable only to Roman law. The highest Greek might be scourged or crucified by a very humble Greek authority. The Roman, as in the Apostle Paul's case, was liable only to Roman officers and military law, and to death by the sword. And the religions equally differed, the Greek representing his deity as the Virgin Goddess Isis,—God incarnate in the form of a virgin; the Roman rather as Maia, or Cybele, the Bride of the Supreme, the human mother of God, raised and invested by him with omnipotence. In the Greek theory Isis was inferior to the Supreme. In the Roman, Cybele held a place of equal power with the Son of the Supreme. The Greek dwelt on her spiritual essence.* The Roman embodied her as the Madonna, the mother and the child. To the masses of both countries, tutelar deities were set up, just as the Spaniards bow to St. Jago, the Russians to St. Nicholas, the Portuguese to St. Sebastian, and the Irish to St. Malachi O'Toole.

Throughout the Macedonian territory the peasants, like the citizens, disarmed, deprived of all manly duties, burdened with oppressive taxation, were kept down by an army almost wholly Sclavoman, and called from the red hair of its privates, the sons of Esau. The officers themselves, part Roman nobles, were in part drawn from the ranks.

From the Adriatic to the Danube, from the Danube to the Wall of Severus, and the line of the Severn, extended the Roman Empire. In the Roman Empire, properly so called again, Roman citizens lived in towns, leaving the country in Italy to be tilled by imported slaves, or in Gaul and Germany, and Spain, by their conquered people, who served as tenants. Hence, as the Roman citizens settled in masses, and having brought their Roman wives with them, they preserved the Latin language and the Latin nationality,—for the language a child

* We are not aware of any Greek images of the Goddess Mother, with an infant. In Etruria, Babylon, and in Memphis, they abounded, precisely agreeing in figure and costume with the pre-Raphaelite pictures. Several of the old Etrurian Madonnas, and Bambinos, have continued objects of worship for two thousand years.

Digitized by Google

always learns is that of its mother,—whilst the Norman conquerors of Britain, scattered amongst, and intermarrying with, their vassals, speedily lost their native language, and became more English than the Saxons themselves. One exception alone occurred to this rule. The tin and copper mines of West Britain had early attracted Jewish merchants, Arab soldiers, and Carthaginian ships. Tin was then more precious than gold; for without tin, bronze could not be fabricated, and national superiority depended in the possession of bronze arms. Many colonists had remained in the mining districts, and by intermarrying with, had materially modified the character of the western population,—the dark complexion, fiery black eye, jet hair, Roman nose, and peculiar combination of wild enthusiasm with mathematical power, which have characterized many of the south Welch peasantry arise, from the Oriental mixture. Whilst Glamorgan, Monmouth, and Caermarthen, were their strongholds, Anglesea seems to have been the seat of their religion, and large garrisons or colonies had evidently been stationed throughout the western coast, from Glasgow to Cornwall, so as to secure exclusive possession of the national territory, leaving the intermediate glens and agricultural and sandstone and slate districts in the hands of the Celtic aborigines. The opposition in features and personal character between them and the population of Southern and Eastern Britain, had been noticed by Tacitus. Strange to say in those districts where there are no coal, iron, or copper mines, this race disappears. Their soldiers do not appear to have charged upon Cæsar, nor to have come into contact with the Romans before the days of Suetonius. In this we may mark God's providence. Although the Romans succeeded in defeating Caractacus, the King of West Britain, they found it impossible to disarm a people who could always find at their own doors the materials for fresh weapons. Hence we find that the guerilla war, continued after the defeat of Caractacus or Caradoc, became so harassing that the Romans restored him, as we restored Dost Mahomet to the Affghans, and employed him at the head of his Welch followers against the Teutonic settlers in Essex, and their Saxon allies from the Baltic coast, erecting a chain of fortresses at Caerleon, Caerwent, and Chester, to check any Welch invasion. The Romans seem to have left the mountain tribes in the same state of freedom that the Scotch Highlanders enjoyed up to 1745, or the Rajah Poots at the present moment in Hindostan.

Now, it pleased God to overrule these peculiar circumstances,

Digitized by Google

to make West Britain the refuge for persecuted saints. If there be any truth in Latin tradition, the daughter of Caractacus was turned by the preaching of Paul; if the Welch tradition be true, Bran, the father of Caractacus, wept at the apostle's feet. Thus West Britain, including the Western part of Scotland, became a refuge for fugitive Christians, just as Argyleshire for Covenanters during the earlier part of the reign of Charles the Second. Yet from peculiar national feelings handed down, it would appear that the missionaries sent over were exclusively Hebrew converts, since they taught the people to keep the Passover, to abstain from meats prohibited by the Mosaic law as well as from things strangled, and from blood. This negatives the idea that Paul himself came over, and would lead us to believe it more probable that messengers were sent direct from the Church at Jerusalem to the Jewish colonists.

Beyond both the Roman and Greek territories, but abutting upon each, lay the fourth great division of mankind, the vast and unnumbered northern tribes, in whose territories the whole Roman world might be swallowed up. These tribes seem to have retained more or less of the worship of Nimrod, the War God, modified by the absence of a permanent priesthood. Their country afforded few mines, the Romans having pushed their frontier to secure Dacia and the Hartz mountains, and the scarcity of iron, as well as the absence of written language, and the feeling of personal independence, had prevented any great progress in civilization. Were England deprived of iron and coal, it would speedily retrograde to the condition of New Zealand. Yet there is reason to believe that the frontier tribes then known only to the Romans, were far the lowest in civilization, having been thrust forward before the more intellectual. The relics of Siberian and Scandinavian magnificence, and the excellent workmanship of the articles found in the tombs of their chiefs, forbid belief that they were rude or uncivilized. Probably their real faith was like that of their descendants now, hanging about them as loosely as the religion of the Sandwich Islands did on its priest-chiefs—a modified Pantheism.

Such was the state of the world when the Assyrian Basilides succeeded to the priesthood of the Virgin and became Grand Master or Chief Abbot of the Essenic brotherhood at Mount Carmel. That he had previously been initiated in the higher mysteries of the Chaldees, amongst whom he had resided, we have ample testimony. He was connected with a vast organization distributed into many grades. They had

Digitized by Google

passwords, signs, and lectures, known only to themselves. He stood at the head, for he had attained all they knew, and was the first astrologer, the first mesmerizer, the first magician* of his day. He saw the progress of the Gospel. It might be corrupted. He proposed to bring about an alliance, therefore, of all *good* men in one bond of liberty, equality, fraternity, who would unite in some one common creed in which Jew, Christian, Sabæan, might all agree without regard to their peculiar profession of faith. This he proposed, and this he accomplished. He, if we may credit the recognised authorities of the Order, was its organiser through the West. His object was clearly to combine the Oriental races against the race of Japheth, and to overthrow the Imperial power.

There existed three forms of Oriental apostasy, differing from each other chiefly from the different origin of their professors and standing in the same connexion as the Greek, Roman, and Coptic Churches now, all agreeing in fundamental error, but each holding some immaterial points in addition to its own. Of these, the first or Cybelic brotherhood we have already alluded to, as having Chaldean origin, but impregnating the higher classes of Rome. Their rule extended through Gaul, through Spain, and even into Britain, but their chief seat was in Chaldea, and the most important of their worshippers was the hereditary High Priest of Hierapolis. The rites of this goddess were distinguished by the self-maceration and cruelty of her priesthood, as by their magical impostures and by the reckless licentiousness of her votaries. Opposed to them in name more than anything else, were the followers of Isis, who recommended fasting, abstinence, and chastity, as the means of winning favour of the goddess-queen. Hers were the mysteries of Eleusis, and,

* For most of these facts we are indebted to the authorized publication of the Masonic body, under the Duke of Sussex, in which Basilides and Ammonius are distinctly claimed as founders of their body, and as having first combined Christianity with the mysteries of Isis, till then confined to the high-born. Into the feud which in the thirteenth century broke out between the initiated and uninitiated followers of the Pontiff, and which was outwardly suppressed by the scourge of St. Dominic,—into the alliance of these two hostile bodies negotiated by Ignatius Loyola against the followers of the Gospel,—into the subsequent quarrel in the eighteenth century,—into the renunciation by English Freemasons of all Anti-Christian rites and practices, and separation from those of the Continent, and the manner in which the Illuminati and Carbonari of the Continent sprang out of the suppressed Jesuits, we may hereafter enter. The subject is full of interest. In the meantime those who are curious may consult Mater, "Histoire de Gnosticisme," and Von Hammer, "Mysterium Baffometis."

Digitized by Google

generally in Greece, and in the great cities, none could marry, or hold office, or carry on the common concerns of the higher classes unless he were initiated. Opposed to the Greek delusion was that of the Egyptians, or Africans, of Osiris, Dionysius, or Bacchus, in which the Egyptian priests, desirous to separate the population from Assyrian influence, had taught them to worship Ham, their great ancestor, and Nimrod his son, rather than the interloping fair-haired Semiramis, the daughter of Japheth, although bride of Cush, just as in Russia St. Nicholas takes the place of the Panagia of the Greeks. The worship of the male principle was that of the slave population. Here, then, was no easy task, to combine the followers of three apostasies alike perilous, but speaking different tongues, and hating each other with more than national hate. All these sects professed and practised magic, had colleges of priests, monks, nuns, friars, associated and lay brethren, the first four classes, except amongst the followers of Osiris, vowed to celibacy. Their processions with tapers lighted in the day-time, and heavy crosses and white-robed and tonsured priests and images of the Queen of Heaven and her demigod, marched from place to place to invoke the aid of heaven. Rich lands were set apart for the support of their colleges, whilst the friars alone were of Roman subjects allowed to beg by law. In the market-places they scourged themselves; admission to their rites was preceded by baptism (total immersion), declared to signify a new birth; all took the sacramental oath, by eating as a sign the unleavened cakes of the Queen of Heaven, and all, by constant confession, rendered themselves the slaves of their chiefs. Tiberius had been their protector, Otho their avowed patron, and although checked by Trajan, and the Antonines, they had in secret, by their pretended magical power, won the favour of the people.

Many of these sects, however, feared and trembled at the name of Christ. They could not deny miracles which even the Jews allowed, but they stumbled at the offence of the *Cross*. They admitted that Jesus was the revealer of all truth, that he came from God; but alike holding the inseparability of sin from matter, they denied that he was very Man of Man, that he had a material body, and maintained that his whole career was spiritual and spiritual only. They admitted him to be the Word of God; they denied that he was the true Messiah, whom they expected to arise from their own race. Such was peculiarly the case with the Babylonian settlers of Samaria, from whom the Yezedees, and Druses, and Ismaylis of Syria

Digitized by Google

probably descend. They sought to combine both creeds, as they had that of Cybele with Judaism. They readily accepted those forged Gospels which, under the name of the Apostles, were composed by Menander, Simon Magus, or their followers, and circulated amongst the people, who had no real desire to feel after God. Hence, through Syria and Egypt, men were ready to allow that Christ had come, but not that he had come in the flesh; that he had reascended to heaven, but not that he was raised from the dead without the encumbrance of a body. We have already referred to the magical arts by which the priests might impose upon excitable minds, and throw them, as they fancied, into communion with the spirits of the dead. These things, however, they used cautiously, disclosing the higher truths only by successive steps to those who were already led away. Step by step the initiated were led on, until at length they were taught to believe that Jesus our Lord was the messenger of the God of this world, the God of the Jews, the Jehovah of Shem;* but that from Ham, the father of Canaan, the true Messiah, the Messenger of the Supreme God, was yet to appear. And this they proved by the pretended Scriptures and revelations which, concealed from their ordinary members, they asserted to have been revealed by Ham alone, and to have been handed down from him. Thus, then, Basilides and his followers contrived to infuse into each as much poison as he could bear, leading true believers to renounce our Lord's spiritual return, seducing the half-enlightened to abandon all belief in the atonement, and to connect sin with the body, not the soul, and drawing the more energetic, daring, and inquisitive into actual worship of the Great Power of Hell. Yet, it is just to say that to the fully initiate they urged the strictest continence, declaring, as is true, that married persons living in the ordinary way could not be brought into those habits of communion with the unseen world, or, in other words, to those mental illusions and spectral visitations on which they depended, which might be obtained by rigid fasting, contemplation, and exclusion.† To the vulgar a less strict discipline was prescribed. Communion with the Church, frequent fastings, devotion to the Virgin Goddess, alms to the brotherhood, and payment to

* Some of these Gnostics believed in the personal reign of our Lord on earth over the Jews, but held that they as *spiritual* men were at death for ever to escape the bondage of matter, and as disembodied essences to dwell with the God of Ham in the firmament.

† This fact has now been ascertained, and is admitted by all mesmerizers and magicians. Perfect clairvoyance is incompatible with sound health.

Digitized by Google

the priest, might open the gate of purgatory, and aid the disciple to rid himself of the material body of flesh.

Such were their popular teachers. But even success with all the Oriental sects would avail nothing. They might bring wealth, zeal, enthusiasm, but the regular army, composed of Sclavonians, Germans, and British, cared just as little for the opinions or opposition of the populace as the English Life Guards for a mob of Hindoos or native Irish. No native Greek, Roman, or Egyptian was recruited. Distinct in language, the army formed a distinct caste. Too poor for voluntary taxation, they could not tempt the priests of Cybele. Yet among them were some real, many professed converts to the Church of Christ. In fact, the Roman army was almost the only shelter for a Christian, since, not being composed of Roman citizens, the Pontifex Maximus had nothing to do with it, and unless the Imperator were actually present, and foolish enough to insist on being himself worshipped, the men were left to follow their own faith without inquiry. Hence there is no reason to doubt the statements of the heretic Tertullian when he asserts that the Roman army was largely influenced, and the less so when we recollect that it was not to the interest of the Imperator that the soldiers should be initiated into the popular mysteries.

Here, then, lay the great object of the tempter. Could he but marry—may we so speak?—the worship of Christ to that of Isis, and thus combine both in one Church, of which he should be the ruler, the prompter, and the chief, of which the Virgin Goddess should be the Mediatrix, and Antichrist the Messiah, his reign on earth would be secured. To do this, caution was necessary. The Christian must be seduced slowly. Instead of separating, like other heretics, from the orthodox Church, *the followers of Basilides joined it,* thus securing a share in the election of the pastors, whilst establishing control and interest in the Church's wealth. To ordinary believers they said nothing of their secret views. To inquiring, restless, or ambitious minds they suggested that Christ and his apostles had taught men as they were able to receive: that whilst to the (in their phraseology) natural man, enslaved by the bondage of matter, they spoke of the Word of God, the Logos and revealer of his will, they communicated yet higher truths to such as were wealthy, and promised them on death entrance into full glory, and spiritual reunion with their real deity, the Evil one,—ideas that even in fancy could not be suggested to those who had not wholly been led away from the name of Christ.

Digitized by Google

Now it must be apparent that no Christian pastor could under these circumstances tell if the deacons of his congregation were or were not Basilidians, any more than a modern minister could tell if they were or not dispensed Jesuits. A recent case occurred during which a professed Dissenting minister had gone on leavening his congregation with Romanism in secret, whilst pretending outwardly to be a Calvinist. The same has occurred in the Church of England, and there is no reason to doubt that Satan was less successful in the primitive Church of Christ than in the nineteenth century.

The followers of Basilides, however, whilst using the same passwords and counter-signs, became separated by essential differences as to everything not necessary, just as modern Freemasons may be Episcopalians, Presbyterians, or Roman Catholics, Whigs, Tories, or Radicals, yet agree to promote their own views. Whilst the genuine Basilidians, from whom all modern masonic bodies descend, recognised Christ as the Revealer, but seldom as the *Redeemer*, those fully initiated in the cabalistic grades ridiculed all who professed a crucified Christ as the worshippers of a phantom, and dupes to an illusion of the senses. They avowed magical powers, and pretended to make themselves invisible. Those who, settled in Chaldea, disclosed their real opinions, transferred much of the history of the Saviour to a heavenly Genius, *Enos*, the Mundo di Chaia, whom they still worship as the true Christ; identifying Jesus our Lord with the Antichrist sent by the angels of the stars to seduce mankind and teach them to neglect deliverance from the thraldom of the body, to seek for a material resurrection, and to substitute the worship of Jehovah for that of the God of Ham. Amongst the Sabæans this creed still subsists, nor is it unknown even on the continent of Europe, nor is any Roman Catholic country free from it still.

Two practices peculiarly characterized these bodies,—the habit of repeating baptism on those who joined them, as the means of initiation, although they had been already baptized; and that of administering extreme unction to, and clothing them in sacrificial garments at death. In fact, Basilidianism may be defined as a device whereby, under the belief that they were learning more of Christ, inquiring minds might be led away from him altogether. So deeply was the snare laid, that it might well deceive all but the elect.

Still this scheme was evidently political, and in reading the history of those days we must recollect that men may

Digitized by Google

have been ignorantly trepanned into joining the first steps of the Basilidian conspiracy, yet innocent as English Freemasons of the abominations of the Rosycrucians and of the Turkish Masonry, which is wholly and solely evil, and which pervades the Continent far more extensively than is generally known.

Still, however, the direct influence of Chaldea was as yet limited to Asia and the Syrian territory. Syria without Egypt is an insecure possession. Satan was at work to secure a stronghold. The condition of Egypt was diametrically opposed to that of Syria. The mountains of Lebanon offer positions everywhere for brave men to rally upon, and glens not to be ravaged till the mountains are stormed. Mountains are always held by the bravest races, who prefer independence to wealth. In the Lebanon the fairest European families flourish, and a spirit of independence has always been maintained. Egypt, on the contrary, is a level ground, where a superior cavalry rides down all resistance. Hence a small race superior in valour may establish over the masses a most absolute despotism. From the days of Cambyses till now, God's declaration has been fulfilled, that there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt, and from that time no white family, unless of Hebrew race, has continued there three generations, although offices of trust, as invariably as in the United States, are restricted to white men. During the last few centuries five millions of white colonists of both sexes have been imported, not to predial slavery, but to rank and power; yet none has left issue to the third generation. Hence there is a constant demand for foreign agency, and Egypt has always attracted the bolder spirits of the East, who, if they live to save, always return to their own land. The silver ornaments that adorn the Arnaoot on his Albanian hills, were won by his father or grandfather on the banks of the Nile. As it was in the days of Lysander, so it is now.

Now the result of this unexplained law of Providence was to make Egypt, in the days of the Cæsars, the centre of mental excitement. In Alexandria, the second city of the world, were collected all those ambitious spirits who, shut out from military employment, could only expend their energies in commercial or philosophical speculation. But nothing deadens any warm religious feelings so much as reckless commercial speculation. Men cannot afford to differ on religion, who seek to cheat each other in business. Hence the universal feeling so natural to the Greek, to become all things to all men. Below them lay a vast middle class, comprised of mixed races, not strictly Mulattoes—for their mothers were

Digitized by Google

Berbers or Ethiopians, who combine far more readily with the white race—but of the class now known as Copts, possessors of great quickness in calculations and considerable metaphysical power, but very deficient in the loftier instincts of human nature. Below all lay the native Egyptian, a good-tempered, hardy, submissive slave, having few wants and fewer desires beyond those of the day. Connecting all these was a large Hebrew population—combining all ranks, possessing in its leading members vast wealth, but numbering in its ranks also the powers of the free community, denaturalized by leaving voluntarily their own land, philosophized by Greek teaching into disbelief of the Messiah, yet still proud of their freedom, and looking upon the naked Egyptian as the Brahmin looks on the Pariah, as the Magyar upon the German. For, by grant of Alexander, the Hebrew poor in Egypt ranked with the Macedonian Arnaoots, and exulted in the dignity of freedom, and were entitled to bear arms—a privilege rigidly withheld from the Egyptian people.

Egypt was the granary of Rome. On her supplies the capital depended for existence. She was the entrepôt of the world's commerce. She was likewise the centre point for the meeting of all faiths.

Such was precisely the soil for Basilidianism to spread, if planted by a native of the country. The masses were intensely ignorant, and deeply galled with the Roman yoke; the higher, very intellectual and very depraved, dissatisfied with everything, looking for excitement, and very anxious to keep the wealth of Egypt for themselves. The name of Christianity had been diffused widely, but its real warmth does not appear to have been strong, and least of all amongst the Greek population. The Berbers longed for admission to the mysteries.

Here, then, was the seat of Satan's next movement. Ammonius Saccas, a Greek by birth, a Chaldee by initiation, and an Egyptian by choice—by character and capacity the first of philosophers and metaphysicians—by travel and experience the most skilled of all men in human nature—it may be, benevolent, well-meaning, but ignorant of divine truth—after all his journeys, had settled at the University of Alexandria. All men hung upon his eloquence—the associate of the Egyptian priesthood, the master of all the mysteries.

At length this mighty philosopher applied to be received a Christian! He was received! He appeared earnest! To him was confided the instruction of the novices and the candidates for education! He was then in his element! His discourses were clearly orthodox. The doctrine of Christ's

Digitized by Google

second coming was, it is true, spoken of as unscriptural and carnal, and the literal meaning of those passages referring to it explained away. The Atonement itself was gradually allowed to fall out of remembrance. Jesus was spoken of as only the great revealer of God's truth to men.

The defects of Ammonius' teaching were those of omission, not denial. He watched the inquiring. To them he gave private instruction, leading them first to see the unity of all religions, then the indifference of all, and finally introducing them step by step into the whole system of Basilides. Very carefully he eschewed all written documents, yet, step by step, men who had begun as Christians became initiated into the mysteries, and sought to cover their heathen profession with a show of Christian truth, just as the Druse Akhal always professes to be a zealous devotee of the faith of the land in which he dwells, and as many Jews enrolled themselves as members of the Inquisition, whilst secretly practising those Jewish rites the Inquisition was formed to exterminate.

Of Ammonius' pupils two were most distinguished—Origen and Heraclas. The first was sent to Chaldea, where he studied; there he suffered that mutilation which was required for initiation into the highest rites of Cybele. Returning, he, by the interest of Ammonius, was appointed head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria. Heraclas, himself equally an adept in magic and mysteries, succeeded through the same influence to the highest Christian office. Need we wonder that, with such leaders, the heathen flocked into the Christian Church? The Church received all who came; but the Church only proved a stepping-stone to admission of the more daring of the lower caste to those mysteries which had been till then reserved to white men.*

The time was now ripe for action. Basilides had organized Syria—Ammonius, Egypt. The Roman army had been tampered with. It had, for economy's sake, been allowed to remain too long in the same quarters. Antioch had always been a perilous position. A long peace, as often happens, rendered parade discipline more stringent, moral control more relaxed. Idleness produced disorder, and the intrigues of the priesthood soon caused mutiny. The Emperor perished.

* Plotinus expressly charges his fellow-pupil, Origen, with having deliberately violated his oath to Ammonius, and revealed the mysteries to low-caste Christians, thereby combining the two systems, and endeavouring to substitute a diluted and modified Christianity for the vague Polytheism of the uninitiated multitude, from whom certain individuals were selected for initiation.

Digitized by Google

The High Priest of Cybele at Hierapolis, Heliogabalus, was unanimously chosen by the troops Imperator, and by the Romans, Pontifex Maximus. Thus the only schismatical line from Nimrod was united to the Roman Pontificate, just as Henry VII. united the blood of the legitimate line of British kings with that of the illegitimate representation of the old Norman sovereigns, to whose throne he succeeded. All titles to the High Priesthood of Venus upon earth, the leadership of all Anti-Christian brotherhoods, now became one.

The first act of the new Pontiff was to declare himself a fresh incarnation of the son of Satan,—Horus Apollo,—and to declare that he and his Virgin Mother were the sole objects of worship. Accompanied by the image of the Virgin Queen, attired as a bride, he rode up to the Capitol, and the Eastern Goddess, now in public with the populace, as before in private with the aristocracy, was substituted for the old northern war-god, Jupiter of the thunderbolt. This, however, was found too bold. Heliogabalus wished to force all religions into one. Now who was the confidant and means of communication between the heathen and the Christian party during this period? At this very period, we are told that wonderful harmony prevailed in the Church. We find no denunciations of Virgin-worship. That would have been to offend the Emperor. Jupiter and Apollo, whose worship was out of favour, might still be assailed; but the great object of all these men was to restore the ascendancy of Orientals. Alexander Severus, himself a Basilidian and honorary member of all Oriental creeds, sought to combine all; and well and ably did Heraclas and Origen carry out his design. So boldly did Origen proceed, that, renouncing his christian name of Adamantus, he adopted that by which he is generally known, and which signifies the son of Horus. From this very moment we find the distinctive doctrines of the Gospel cease to be taught. The Trinity, the Atonement, are no longer spoken of; the return of Christ to rule is denied; the resurrection of the body spiritualized away. Yet Protestants, in their anxiety to find testimony in the early Church, have spoken of these men as saints, because, although they teach salvation exclusively by self-mortification, they do not directly aver transubstantiation. It is thus that baptismal regeneration has been supported, because held by early apostates. The Church of Rome will explain this. She tells us that transubstantiation and the worship of the Virgin were kept back for the initiated; that those doctrines, as well as the

Digitized by Google

Incarnation, were carefully concealed from the people without. To the people there was nothing taught but saintly mediation with the one God, those only who were deemed worthy being led to the Mediator himself, without human intercession.*

It might be worth while to ask, how many of her flock the Italian Church deems worthy to behold in Christ the full propitiation for sin, the sole mediator between God and man?

Let us now see for ourselves what sort of doctrine Origen and Heraclas and Clement of Alexandria really taught. The Church of Rome cannot refuse their authority; for Clement, at all events, has been canonized, and is held out as able to save those who come to his shrine by the superabundance of his merits. Yet he was Origen's guide, philosopher, and friend.

First, as to Origen. We find that he circulated amongst the initiated two books on magic, which he attributed to James and Jambres, the magicians who stood before Pharaoh, and whom he represented as inspired prophets, and that, amongst the half-initiated, he recommended the Apocalypse of Elijah and Jeremiah, works now lost, but which appear to have been confined to the elect.

Secondly. That they, according to him, occupy the highest place, who have attained to the knowledge of the true God. Then, those who worship Christ as God. Thirdly, those who worship God through the medium of the planets. This exactly agrees with the three grades into which were divided the followers of Basilides, as apprentices, fellow craftsmen, and perfect masters.

Thirdly. That Christ is not an object of prayer, being a *derived*, not an independent being.

Fourthly. That magic is a true and lawful science; and that the names of Sabaoth, Adonai, and the angels Gabriel and Raphael, may by the initiated be used with great success, as containing magical powers when rightly pronounced, and that the right pronunciation was known amongst the Magi of the Chaldees, and that there is magic power in the name Jehovah.†

* Mr. Newman, in his "History of the Arians," fights stoutly for the orthodoxy of Origen, and certainly succeeds in proving that Origen, in principle as well as practice, agrees precisely with modern Tractarians. Is there not much to be inferred from this, and that Origen and the Tractarians pursued the same course with a view to the same end?

† Those who are at all acquainted with the history of magic and the Cabala, will see in this the key-note of the apostasy. In all Rabbinical and Antichristian secret organizations, the real pronunciation of the word Jehovah is the thing sought and promised to the initiated who shall reach

Digitized by Google

Nor are these the least. From his master, Ammonius, this man had learned the art of communicating with the demons; in other words, of producing visions, similar to those of Baron Dupotet, in the retina of the initiated.

Are we to call Origen a Christian? Those who believe him such may surely consider General Whitelocke a brave and loyal soldier; Vortigern, who called in the Saxons against the Christian people of his country, a patriot king.

But we may go a little farther. We find Origen's preceptor and friend, Clement of Alexandria, admits the division of the Christians into three grades, corresponding with the three ranks of masonry, to the first of whom the literal, the second the moral, the third the mystic sense of Scripture was communicated, and its identity with the doctrines of the old philosophers; and we find further, that whilst Christ's Godhead was acknowledged in public, it was in the writings addressed to the *initiated* explained away.

Such was the teaching of the Church as it is so called. Can we wonder at its fruits?

The time seemed ripe now to combine all faiths in one. Heliogabalus' rashness inflamed Rome. Satan was not asleep. Origen was sent for. Mammæa, the High Priestess of Venus, and Mithra, caballed with him. The Basilidian, the Christian, and the Mithraist, all joined, and a new form of religion was established. The Emperor adding Christ to the number of his gods, and encouraging Christianity as preached *by Origen.* Need we feel surprised that this led to a reaction against Christianity?

But for the purposes of these the accession of Alexander Severus was not sufficient. A priest, he could shake the sistrum, but his arm failed to sway the sabre. A sterner chief must be found, and a more unscrupulous. Philip, the Arab, alone of Roman Generals, claimed Oriental origin. By blood an Arab, he was as a foreigner eligible for military service. In principle reckless, he became a popular tool. Such was Philip. All things conspired for his purposes. Men doubt if he were a Christian or a Heathen. He was baptized, yet presided over the secular games in honour of the Goddess Queen. Origen was his preceptor, his tutor, and his friend.

The reign of Philip was short. Had it been prolonged, *pure* Christianity might have suffered more. The reaction which followed, served the true Church, even if it scourged

the highest grade, and amongst the Rosycrucians there is reason to fear that Satan is ultimately taught to be the true Jehovah.

Digitized by Google

its members. Decius, the northern Prince, chosen by the Thracian soldiery, crushed all Arab opposition, and sternly proceeded to crush every Asiatic and unlawful creed. A ready way of escape presented itself to the half believing and unconverted. They had but to enrol themselves in those legalized mysteries of Isis, which Origen and Clement declared to contain all truth. The pass-word once given they were safe. Origen himself renounced the Saviour. The Christian became a *secret* creed, a *secret* discipline. Its genuine professors fled to Armenia, to Persia, or to Britain; its enthusiastic but ignorant supporters from Egypt and Syria sought refuge in the desert. None were left to stand up for the truth, and of those who fled into the desert most returned ultimately corrupted by their associations, and led away by worship of the Goddess Queen.

Here, then, we must at present close. Christianity, for a time suppressed, combined in secret with the worshippers of Isis to throw off the despotism of the northern sovereigns. We know little of the intrigues of the period. One thing alone is certain, that the followers of Isis, of Cybele, and of Basilides, alike hailed the rise of Constantine, and assisted him to win the Imperial crown. Writhing under past sufferings, all the Orientals rejoiced in an Emperor purely Oriental, averse to Roman nationality, indifferent to the old Polytheism. Even real Christians feared to stir up strife, by preaching the Gospel in its fulness. Thus, Gnostic corruption had its fearful course. The Church more and more became mingled with idolaters, and had the false peace of Dioclesian's early years continued, must have perished utterly. A crisis was impending. Christianity as well as Polytheism appeared about to give way before a fresh development of Gnosticism from the East in its fiercest form, and the open worship of Satan under the name of Manichæanism, to supersede all other rites.

Into the origin of this new heresy, the struggle into which it entered with Heathenism, the sufferings and the short apparent triumph of the Christian Church; its subsequent alliance with the worshippers of Cybele, and the transfer of the High Priesthood of the Mother of God to the Roman Bishop, who thus became the civil and ecclesiastical head of the Roman Empire, as distinguished from the Greek, we may not now enter. Perhaps at some future period this difficult subject may also be examined in the same spirit with that of the preceding pages. In the meantime the writer of this article would intreat the prayers of those who read, that in his

Digitized by Google

investigation of the dark passages of ancient time he may be guided by light from above. Many duties leave him small time for researches which require the natural abilities, the learning, and the piety of a Birks, a Chalmers, or an Elliott, and his only hope is to indicate a course of study which may be pursued with profit by more eminent servants of God.

Art. II.—GENESIS.

Chapter II. ver. 1.—"Thus (or *and*) the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them."

God now proclaims the completion of his creation-work.* It was no mere sketch or outline: it was no half-finished plan: it was a "finished" work. A goodly and glorious work! Not merely on account of what we see and touch in it, but on account of what we cannot see or touch. For creation is full of secrets. Science, in these last days, has extracted not a few, but how many remain secrets still! What a multitude of *hidden* wonders does each part of creation contain! Outwardly, how marvellous for the order, beauty, utility of all its parts; inwardly, how much more marvellous for the secret springs of life, motion, order, health, fruitfulness, and power! Each part, how wondrous in itself, as perfect in its kind; yet no less wondrous, as wrapping up within itself the seeds of ten thousand other creations, as perfect, hereafter to spring from them. God proclaims the perfection of his works, not as man does, in vain-glory, but that he may fix our eye on their excellency, and let us know that He, the Former of them, is fully satisfied, and that his work is now ready for its various functions and uses. The great machine is completed, and now about to begin its operations.†

* It may be well to notice that the word "finished" here is the same as is used in such passages as the following: Ex. xl. 33, "So Moses *finished* the work;" 2 Chron. vii. 11, "Thus Solomon *finished* the house." And as of these types of redemption, the tabernacle and temple, it is said they were "finished," so of redemption itself it is said, "it is finished." (John xx. 30.) And as the *old* creation is thus spoken of as being "finished," so is the *new*, for after He that sat on the throne had said, "Behold, I make all things new," it is added, "it is done"—it is finished. (Rev. xxi. 5, 6.)

† *The Host.* Such passages as Deut. iv. 19, and Isa. xxxiv. 4, shew that this expression is used in reference to sun, moon, and stars; Josh. v. 14, that it means God's *living* army, probably referring to Israel, not to angels. (See Exod. xii. 41: "the hosts of Jehovah went out from the land of Egypt.") It is used of angels, 1 Kings xxii. 19; Ps. ciii. 21; cxlviii. 2. In Luke ii. 13, we read of "the heavenly host," *στρατιὰ ὀυράνιος*, referring to angels; and in Matt. xxiv. 29, *δυνάμεις τῶν ὀυρανῶν*, the

Digitized by Google

Ver. 2.—"And on the seventh day God ended (had finished, completed *) his work which He had made, and He rested on the seventh day from all his work which He had made. 3 And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all his work which God created and made."

By the close of the sixth day God had finished his work, so that, as that day's sun set, announcing the seventh day begun, all was completed. God stands here on the line that separates these two days; he looks back on the past, and forward to the future. He sees and surveys a finished work, and He "returns to his place"—He "rests." His rest is soon disturbed, as we shall see, by man's sin, so that He is compelled to begin anew his work (the far more laborious work of *renewing* a world); but meanwhile He "rests;" and his purpose is to make all creatures partakers of this rest. He rests, not because weary, but because his work is done; and yet, no doubt, that word "rest" was intended to declare to us the profounder tranquillity that there is, even to the Creator, in rest than in labour.

The day of this completion and this rest must be made memorable for ever.† From that moment, each seventh day must be marked off, as a day of remembrance, a day to be kept differently from other days, even had man never fallen. For, as man, being a dweller on earth, has many *common* duties to perform, which are no less needful than those which are directly spiritual, so God has appointed six days during

powers of heaven, referring to stars, &c. God's special name, Jehovah Sabaoth, Lord of Hosts, is not used in the earlier books of Scripture. It does not occur till 1 Sam. i. 3; but after that it occurs about 300 times in the Old Testament; only twice in the new, Rom. ix. 29; Jas. v. 4.

* The Hebrew word here is the same as in the preceding verse, though our translation gives it as if it were different. Moses' meaning is, that God "on the seventh day *had completed* his work." (M. Stuart. Chrestomathy, p. 123.) There is no need of the Sept. or Samar. reading, "sixth day," in order to prevent its being supposed that God did any work on the seventh. "Verbum non est vertendum in perfecto *complevit*, sed in plusquam perfecto, *compleverat*."—Pfeiffer. Dubia Scripturæ.

† Calvin, in his "Commentary on Genesis," points out this. He shews that God blessed and sanctified the Sabbath, "ut seculis omnibus inter homines sancta foret;" and that its observance was not to be confined "to one age or people, but is common to the whole human race." He then shews that Judaism introduced certain peculiarities into the observance of the Sabbath. These were done away in Christ, but the Sabbath itself remained. Nay, in so far as the Sabbath prefigured the spiritual rest which Christ brought, it might be said to have passed into its antitype. But, in so far as it was a day set apart from the beginning for the service of God, it was to remain, ad mundi finem usque durare oportet. Such were Calvin's ideas of the "abrogation" of the Sabbath, of which so much has been said.

Digitized by Google

which these common duties are to be sanctified, and one day during which they are to be wholly set aside. They that confound these two things, and profess to make every day a Sabbath, are making void the original purpose of God. God's purpose never was to make every day a Sabbath, and it is mock-sanctity to say so. They who would raise every day to the level of a Sabbath are quite as far from the aim of the divine institution as they who drag down the Sabbath to the level of a common day. During the six days man was to shew how he could serve and glorify God *in* the common duties of life; on the Sabbath he was to shew how God was to be served and glorified by acts of direct and unmingled worship. This is the *principle* of the great Sabbath-institute—a principle which runs through all ages—more so than ever in these last days, when men are either denying religion altogether, or endeavouring to eject it from every-day life, and confine it to a peculiar region of its own.

This seventh day God "blest." He uttered his mind concerning it, calling it a day of blessing, and in so doing, communicated to it (as it were) the power to impart blessing, that is, He made it the day in which he would specially give blessing.* This is, then, the primary meaning and object of the Sabbath. It is the day on which God specially blesses man. But more than this. It is added, He "sanctified it." He marked it off from all other days, as the tabernacle was marked off from all the tents of Israel. He drew a fence around it, which was not to be broken through. He set it apart for *himself*, just as he set the six days apart for man. It was to be *his* day, not *man's*, just as the altar was *his* altar, the laver *his* laver, not man's.† And when, or where, or how has God's claim to a Sabbath been renounced? When has his setting apart been done away? Men speak

* In this sense it is that inanimate things are often spoken of as being *blessed* by God: Exod. xxiii. 25, "He shall *bless* thy bread and thy water;" Ps. lxv. 10, "thou *blessest* the springing thereof;" cxxxv. 15, "I will abundantly *bless* her provision;" Prov. iii. 33, "He *blesseth* the habitation of the just." M. Stuart paraphrases it, "God declared this day to be worthy of peculiar distinction, honour, and observance." ("Hebrew Chrestomathy," p. 123.) In the Greek it is ἐυλογησε, "He spake well of the day." We "bless" God when we speak well of Him, that is, *tell* of his goodness. He blesses us when He speaks well of us, and *imparts* his goodness.

† This use of the word *sanctify* is so common that we need only refer to such passages as the following in proof: Exod. xxix. 37, 44; Josh. xx. 7; Neh. iii. 1. The literal *seventh* was of no consequence. It could not be the same day over all the world. A *seventh* of days was all that was implied. In Heb. iv. 3, 4, the Apostle's object is to state that there was a

Digitized by Google

and act as if this "blessing," this "sanctification" of the day were a yoke not to be borne; as if the Sabbath were a curse, not a blessing; as if the Gospel had at length broken fetters forged in Eden by God for man! But, no. The Sabbath was set up by God, and by him only can be taken down. It was set up (1) as a memorial of past labour; (2) as a pillar of testimony to God as Creator; (3) as a proclamation of rest; (4) as a type and earnest of coming rest. These four points in particular contain God's reasons for the institution of this day. All these are still in force; nor has the Gospel blunted the edge of any of them, least of all *the last*. Till the antitype come, the type must remain. Till that glorious rest arrive—better than creation-rest, better than Canaan-rest (Heb. iv.)—its type must remain. Nor is it easy to understand the reason why some, calling themselves expectants of this coming rest, should be so anxious to set aside the type of it. It is strange also that now, when the resurrection of Christ has added another to the many reasons for observing a day like this, we should be asked to abolish it! *

Vers. 4, 5.—"These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, and every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground."

---

rest—a rest which began on the finishing of the works—which was therefore *past*, not *future;* so that it could not be this rest, into which faith is to introduce, and from which unbelief shuts us out. It is a future rest to which faith looks forward.

* No doubt God's rest was broken by man's sin. But this made it only the more needful to keep up the Sabbath as a memorial of that rest which man had broken, and an earnest of that rest which is in reserve for us. Let us not forget that the Sabbath was not a Judaical ordinance; and to prevent such an idea, the fourth commandment commences with REMEMBER, calling on Israel to keep in mind an old commandment which had been in the world from the beginning. The word Sabbath (signifying *rest*) does not only refer to *our* resting, but to God's resting. Man's sin marred God's rest-day, by compelling Him (we speak after the manner of men) to begin working anew. This new-creation-work is still going on; and to this our Lord refers (John v. 17), "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," that is, our Sabbath is not yet begun, and therefore I cannot be charged with breaking the Sabbath in working miracles. When this new creation-work has been finished (the old creation took six days, the new creation 6000 years), then the interrupted Sabbath shall be resumed, at the point where it was broken in upon; only on a higher and heavenlier scale, with Eden restored, Satan expelled, all things made new, the second Adam and the second Eve having dominion over all things; God resting from his work, and rejoicing in his Sabbath,—the *Sabbatism* which the Apostle speaks of as remaining for the people of God. (Heb. iv. 9.)

Digitized by Google

This fourth verse should commence a new chapter, and is connected with what follows.* The first three verses should be thrown back into the previous chapter. A new section of creation-history now begins, and the fourth verse is the title or heading: "The following are the details of what took place when God created heaven and earth." The fifth is intended to state that all that was done was entirely *God's doing*, without the help of second causes, without the refreshment of rain, without the aid of man. There had been no power in action hitherto but God's alone. His hand, directly and alone, had done all that was done, in making plants and herbs to grow. The soil was not *of itself* productive; no previous seed existed; there was no former growth to spring up again. All was the finger of God. He is the sole Creator. Second causes, as they are called, are his creations: they owe their being, their influence to Him. The operations of nature, as men speak, are but the actings of the invisible God. God is in everything. Not as the Pantheist would have it, a part of everything, so that nature is God; but a personal Being, in everything, yet distinct from everything; filling, quickening, guiding creation in all its parts, yet no more the same with it than the pilot is with the vessel he steers, or the painter with the canvass on which he flings all the hues of earth and heaven. Let us beware of this subtle delusion of the evil one, the confounding of the creature with the Creator; of God, "the King eternal, immortal, and invisible," with the hills, and plains, and forests, and flowers, which He has made. To deify nature seems one of the special errors of the last days. And no wonder; for if nature be deified, then man is deified too. Man becomes God, and nature is the throne on which he sits. Let us not lose sight

* Generations. תּוֹלְדוֹת. The Seventy render it *ἄυτη ἡ βιβλος γενέσεως*, as in Matt. i. 1. Literally it is *births*, things brought forth. Here and in ch. vi. 9, xi. 27, xxxvii. 2, it signifies accounts of the origin of,—generations, descents, genealogical notices. (Turner's "Companion to Genesis," p. 175.) In the passages above referred to, it will be seen that the words, "these are the generations," always point forward, not backward. Dathe gives *origines* as the meaning. Rosenmuller denies that the word ever means this, and gives, as its interpretation, *enarratio, historia*. Rungius remarks that the word signifies "both the production of things, and the narrative of their production." (p. 92.) After quoting this fourth verse, Pearson remarks, "So the creation or production of anything, by which it is, and before was not, is a kind of *generation*, and consequently the creator or producer of it a kind of *father*; 'hath the rain a father, or who hath begotten the drops of dew?' (Job xxxviii. 28), by which words Job signifies that as there is no other cause assignable of the rain but God, so may he, as the cause, be called the *Father* of it."—*On the Creed, Art. I.*

Digitized by Google

of God in nature. Let not that which is the manifestation of his glory be turned by us into an obscuration of himself. Let us look straight to the living God. Not nature, but God; not providence, but God; not the law, but the law-giver; not the voice, but the speaker; not the instrument and its wide melodies, but the Master who formed the lyre, and whose hands are drawing the music out of its wondrous chords! *

Ver. 6.—"But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground."

To supply the want of rain God called up a mist which watered the ground, so that herb and plant were now refreshed. Ere He brings man into the midst of his works, He burnishes them, and makes them resplendent with freshest green. It is of this "mist" that Job speaks (xxxvi. 27), "He maketh small the drops of water: they pour down rain according to the vapour thereof;" Jeremiah also, "He causeth the vapours to ascend from the ends of the earth" (x. 13); thus directly ascribing to Jehovah as much the continuance as the creation of this watering mist. He makes it! He who built the hills, and lighted up the stars—He is the creator of the thin airy vapour which disappears in a moment. And in all these parts of his infinitely varied handiwork He has taught us to read solemn lessons. In the ocean the breadth of eternity; in the mountains the stability of the covenant; in the vapour the shortness of our mortal life

* Schiller's poetry is perhaps the saddest yet most fascinating exemplification of the spirit referred to above. His very beauties are often the most painful parts of his works. His poem on "The Gods of Greece" is one of his worst, much admired as it has been.

"Man gifted nature with divinity,
To lift and link her to the breast of love!"

"Cold, from the north, has gone
Over the flowers, the blast that killed their May;
And, to enrich the worship of the One,
A universe of gods must pass away!"

All this, and much more, from one of the lords of modern thought! Was Satan ever more beautifully disguised as an angel of light than in such a man? Is not German poetry, German metaphysics, German theology, making havoc among us? Is it not the combined action of the three that is producing that school which, with such supercilious dislike of Evangelical truth, is setting itself to make war against what it so childishly calls Bibliolatry? Under covert of this evil name, thus, after no brave or manly fashion, fastened on their opponents, they hope to advance to their great work of undermining and overthrowing the verbal inspiration of the Word of God. We again commend Count Gasparin's admirable little work on plenary inspiration, translated by Mr. Montgomery.

Digitized by Google

(James iv. 14). All nature teems with truth, concerning the past, the present, and the future. And this God, who created the vapour, and made that vapour a figure of man's life, is the God who careth for us, the God who wants to give us the life that is no vapour—the heritage that cannot pass away! And the mist that waters and revives the summer flower is not more free than the eternal life which he gives us in his Son.

Ver. 7.—" And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

In the fifth verse we were specially reminded that "there was not a man to till the ground;" now this want is to be removed; and from this way of noticing man's creation we are taught that, just as the ground was made for man, so man was made for the ground. He has a claim on it, and it has a claim on him. Accordingly it is to the peculiar link between him and the ground that our attention is now turned. He is closely connected with the ground, for out of it he was made. Hitherto we have been merely told of man being created by God; but not a word has been said of *how*, or out of *what*, he was formed. Now we are told, it was of "the dust of the ground;" of the finer and more elemental parts of this material earth. He was formed "dust of the ground," for so the words run literally. This refers of course to his body, teaching us that *it* was made first, and then, after that, God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (or lives), and he became a living soul.* As we know that the stoppage of the breath causes the cessation of life, so the impartation of the breath was the production of life, as if the breath were the link between the soul and body, so that, in breaking it, the soul and body fall asunder. Here is the potter and the clay! Man bears no part in his own creation. His flesh is taken out of the dust beneath him; his soul comes down straight

* נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, literally a soul of life, a living animated being,—εις ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, Sept. It is to this the Apostle refers in 1 Cor. xv. 45, in which he uses the very words of the Septuagint, above quoted, preserving even the Hebrew idiom. The "breath of lives" seems to be that breath by which the *lives* (animal and rational) are kept in play, as well as linked to the body. It is to this expression that the Apostle seems to refer in Acts xvii. 25, "He giveth to all, life and breath,"—ζωὴν καὶ πνοήν. On this whole subject the reader may consult Howe's "Principles of the Oracles of God," Lect. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20; Flavel's "Treatise on the Soul;" and Christopher Ness's quaint work, "The History and Mystery of the Old and New Testament," ch. iv. See also Tertullian's curious Treatise "De Anima."

Digitized by Google

from God above, made out of we know not what; called, perhaps, directly out of nothing. That which is material may come out of a mass of previously existing matter; but who will say that the immaterial is brought out of a mass of previously existing spirit? No. The soul comes at once from Him of whom it is said, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." (John i. 4.) It is the Son, the second person of the Godhead, that is "the Life"—the living and life-giving one. It was He who with one hand, as it were, taking up a body out of the dust, and with the other creating a soul by the word of his power, brought them together, and then cemented them together with the "breath of lives," which he breathed into the nostrils. Thus the threefold cord which is not quickly broken (the corporeal life, the animal life, and the intellectual life) was thrown around this new piece of creation, and the soul and body married together in a union which only sin could dissolve.

Such are the two extremes of man's nature, body and soul. Such are the sources of both; the one low, the other lofty. And possessed of this twofold being—thus strangely compounded of the low and the high, of the material and the immaterial—is he not taught on the one hand to be profoundly humble, and on the other to soar upwards to Jehovah with a noble ambition, resting satisfied nowhere but in the bosom of his God?

Of our original dust we are often reminded by God. He recurs frequently to the term, as a figure for such things as the following:—It is the emblem of frailty (Ps. ciii. 14); can we then be self-confident, or ever cherish "the pride of life?" It is the emblem of *nothingness* (Gen. xviii. 27); and can we boast of our sufficiency, or deem ourselves aught, when compared with the All-sufficient One? It is the emblem of *defilement* (Isa. lii. 2); and shall we vaunt of purity? It is the emblem of *humiliation* (Lam. iii. 29, Job xlii. 6); and shall we be puffed up, we who are but dust and ashes? It is the emblem of *mourning* (Josh. vii. 6); and shall we exult, as if no tribulation could reach us, or say with Babylon, "I shall see no sorrow?" It is the emblem of *mortality* (Eccles. iii. 20, xii. 7); and shall we trust in our dying life, as if death could not invade us? O man, thou art dust! Canst thou be proud or high-minded? Canst thou put thy confidence in anything into which the element of dust enters?

Yet, let us remember, there is nothing sinful in this dust out of which we are framed. Ours is indeed a lowly origin, but not an unholy one. There is nothing sinful in the soil

Digitized by Google

of earth. The curse is on it and in it, for man's sin. But the soil itself contains no defilement. Out of this very dust was fashioned the body of Him who took our flesh. The Son of the Highest has taken into his person this very dust of ours, thereby showing us that there is nothing in it really vile; nay, thereby putting wondrous honour upon it, and elevating it to a seat upon the very throne of God. Out of this dust our resurrection bodies are to be formed; so that when this corruptible shall put on incorruption, we shall not the less be possessors of a body derived from the "dust of the ground." This body of ours is yet to sit upon the throne of the universe. We have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.

But we have souls as well as bodies; and these souls are specially God's handiwork. He made them what they are. We got them directly from Him at first, and "in him we live, and move, and have our being." (Job xii. 10; xxvii. 3; iii. 4; xxxiv. 14; Eccles. xii. 7.) This is the highest and noblest kind of creation. Man cannot make, but he can unmake it; he cannot create, but he can ruin it; for he can introduce into it that which is its ruin,—SIN. God only can either make it out of nothing, or remake after it is ruined. Both are the acts of Him who is "the Life." The first life came from Him, much more the new life; and his act when creating the first life corresponds strikingly to that of which it is said, "He *breathed on them,* and said, receive ye the Holy Ghost." The second life is indeed produced in the way of *birth* (a birth of God, a birth from above), so that the whole mature soul is not imparted at once, but still the source of the life is the same,—the life-giving fountain is the same, only it communicates a higher kind of life. (1 Cor. xv. 45.) "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." It is more abundant life. (John x. 10.) "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." Our whole new being is to be after a higher model, and cast in a far finer mould. (1 Cor. xv. 49.) "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

Ver. 8.—"And the Lord God planted a garden, eastward, in Eden (Heb. in Eden from the East), and there he put the man whom he had formed."

We now learn in what region, and in what part of that region man was placed. It was in the eastern extremity of a region named Eden; a region whose locality was, it would seem, well known in the days of Moses, but now only to be guessed

Digitized by Google

at.* *When* it took the name of "Eden," whether so named at first by God, or afterwards by Adam, or not till later ages, we know not. It signifies "delight," being so named from its surpassing beauty and fruitfulness. It was a land, the like of which has not since been seen on earth; fairer and richer than that which flowed with milk and honey; a land of broad rivers and streams; a land of sunshine and gladness; a land of flowers and gems; a land of the myrtle and the olive and the palm and the vine; a land which was the glory of all lands; which has left its name behind it to all ages, as a name of fruitfulness, and fragrance, and beauty.

In the eastern corner of this "delightsome land," this more than Beulah, God planted a garden with his own hand, a garden which afterwards, from an Eastern term, took the name of Paradise, and is often alluded to in Scripture as the "garden of the Lord," the "garden of God." (Gen. xiii. 10; Is. li. 3; Ezek. xxviii. 13; xxxi. 8, 9; xxxvi. 35; Joel ii. 3.†) This peculiar spot of earth, this inner circle, was to be man's residence. There he was to dwell. There he was to meet with God, there to walk with God, there, as in creation's palace, to take up his abode, as creation's king; and from his throne there to exercise his kingly dominion over an undefiled and happy earth.‡

Ver. 9.—"And out of the ground, made the Lord God to grow (or spring), every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also (*Heb.*, and the tree of the life, or lives), in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."

The garden was nobly stored. It was a princely orchard. Its fruitful soil gave growth to every various tree and shrub. Nothing was awanting to make it altogether suitable for its dwellers. Every tree which the eye loves to look upon, or

* To enumerate the dissertations on the site of Eden would be well nigh impossible. One of the largest is the "Synopsis Paradisi, &c., per Joannem Hopkinsonum," published in one of the supplemental volumes of the "Crit. Sacri." Dathe, Rosenmuller, and Stuart have pretty large notes on the subject of the four rivers; and Pfeiffer in his "Dubia Vexata Scripturæ," with some show of evidence, decides that Euphrates is the one main stream —divided afterwards into four channels. Perhaps the best statement on the subject is in the Pictorial Bible.

† The Paradise mentioned in Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7, is the heavenly counterpart to the earthly Paradise; for no doubt the latter was "after the pattern of heavenly things."

‡ Paradise was the inner circle, Eden, around it, the outer; the whole earth around, the outermost; corresponding to the three divisions in the tabernacle, the most holy, the holy, and the outer court; and corresponding to the three great divisions in millennial days,—the heavenly Jerusalem, and the Church its dweller; the earthly Jerusalem, with Israel its dweller; and the earth at large, with the Gentile nations inhabiting it.

Digitized by Google

which is good for food, was there. No sense remained ungratified. But two special trees were there, the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. *

1. *The tree of life.* This was a real tree, as real as any of the rest, and evidently placed there for like purposes with the rest. The only difference was, that it had peculiar virtues which the others had not. It was a life-giving or life-sustaining tree, a tree of which, so long as man should continue to eat he should never die. Not that *one* eating of it could confer immortality; but the continuous use of it was intended for this. Not that man was made mortal as he now is; the use of means does not necessarily denote some such innate defect. Man had to eat of food even when unfallen, yet this did not prove him to have been originally a dying creature. Nay, Christ had to partake of food, but this did not argue any defect in Him. So did not the existence of the tree of life and man's need to eat thereof argue any original defect in man. The link between soul and body was to be maintained by this tree. So long as he partook of this, that tie could not be broken.†

* It is interesting to notice the references to the trees of Eden. Not only is Eden itself used as a figure for a region of excellent beauty (Isaiah li. 3; Ezekiel xxxvi. 35; Joel ii. 3), but the *trees* of Eden are referred to three times by Ezekiel in a most striking way, "cedars," "fir-trees," and "chesnut-trees," being specified (xxxi. 8). The Assyrian is compared to the trees of Eden, and it is said of him, "that no tree in the garden of God was like unto him in his beauty," nay, "all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God envied him." Ezekiel's references to Eden cannot fail to strike the reader. It was in the Edenic region that he dwelt in his captivity, on the banks of Hiddekel, as in the case of Daniel (x. 4), and just as David's psalms bear witness to the deserts and hills where he was hunted, so Ezekiel's prophecies show us that before his eyes visions of Eden were brought, called up by the scene around and the histories or traditions connected with the scene. Ezekiel and John are the two prophets that abound in references to Eden and Paradise, with its trees and precious stones. Now, Ezekiel's is the *Jewish* apocalypse and John's the *Christian.* The former is the apocalypse of the "earthly things," the latter of the "heavenly things."

† This is the natural meaning of the expression "tree of life," namely, a life-imparting tree, just as "the bread of life" means life-imparting bread, and as the "water of life" means life-imparting water. Of course the expression itself does not prove it to be a literal tree, just as these others are not literal bread nor literal water. But then the tree having been proved to be a literal tree from the context, we may use these parallel forms of speech to illustrate its meaning. "The very denomination 'tree of life' would signify to us that there was in it a faculty of either giving or preserving life."—*Burton's View of the Creation of the World,* p. 209. The son of Sirach calls it δενδρον ἀθανασιας, the tree of immortality. Lord Barrington, in his "Essay on the Dispensations," says, "The tree of life is a tree that could preserve life." He then gives eight reasons for this.

2. *The tree of the knowledge of good and evil.* Why may we not take this in the same literality of meaning as the former? Why may it not mean a tree, the fruit of which was fitted to nourish man's intellectual and moral nature? *How* it did this I do not attempt to say. But we know so little of the actings of the body or the soul, that we cannot affirm it impossible. Nay, we see so much of the effects of the body upon the soul, both in sharpening and blunting the edge alike of intellect and conscience, that we may pronounce it not at all unlikely. We are only beginning to be aware of the exceeding delicacy of our mental and moral mechanism, and how easily that mechanism is injured or improved by the things which affect the body. A healthy body tends greatly to produce not only a healthy intellect, but a healthy *conscience.* I know that only one thing can really pacify the conscience,—the all-cleansing blood; but this I also know that a diseased or enfeebled body operates oftentimes so sadly on the conscience as to prevent the healthy realization by it of that wondrous blood, thereby beclouding the whole soul; and there is nothing which Satan seems so completely to get hold of, and by means of it to rule the inner man, as a nervously-diseased body. Cowper's expression, " A mind *well-lodged*, and *masculine of course*," has in it more meaning than we have commonly attached to it.*

Ver. 10.—" And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads. 11. The name of the first is Pison; that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold. 12. And the gold of that land is good: there is bdellium and the onyx stone. 13. And the name of the second river is Gihon; the same is that which compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia. (*Heb.* Cush.) 14. And the name of the third river is Hiddekel; that is it which goeth towards the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates." †

Works, vol. 2, p. 408—412. He is more successful in these than when in a subsequent paragraph he endeavours to prove that the tree of knowledge was a poisonous tree producing death. Venema takes the same view of the tree of life,—" Nothing remains but that we consider the name given to it as meaning that it did possess a certain power, communicated to it by God, of preserving, prolonging, and gladdening, the life of man on earth." —*System of Theology*, ch. 26. Also his *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. i., p. 26.

* If our translation of Is. vii. 15 (and the Vulgate), be correct (" butter and honey shall he eat that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good "), there would be a striking instance of the truth referred to above. But as the passage may as well run " *when* he shall know," &c., I do not press it. Jonathan's eyes were enlightened by the tasting of the honey. (1 Sam. xiv. 27.)

† Both in the writings of the fathers and in the old Latin hymns, these

For this fair region a river was provided,—a noble river,—fit counterpart of that "river of bliss" which

"Thro' midst of heaven,
Rolls o'er Elysian flowers her amber stream."

Where this mighty river rose is not said. It found its way into Eden from the lofty mountains which incircled that glorious region. Then passing through Eden, it glided onwards into Paradise, and there might be seen "winding at its own sweet will," till it reached the other extremity of the garden. There it was subdivided into four heads.* These were (1), † Pison, compassing the land of Havilah, in which

four streams are spiritualized into the four evangelists. "Paradisi haec fluenta," says one hymnist, and another enlarges on this with some beauty,

"Paradisus his rigatur
Viret, floret, fœcundatur,
His abundat, his laetatur
Quatuor fluminibus.
Fons est Christus, hi sunt rivi,
Fons est altus, hi proclivi,
Ut saporem fontis vivi
Ministrent fidelibus."

Daniel, "*Thes. Hymnol.*," vol. 2, p. 85.

* Heads רָאשִׁים or beginnings, that is, "four lesser rivers into which a larger spreads itself." (Ezek. xvi. 25), "every head of the way," that is, the beginning, the place where ways branch off. (See Gesenius.) That "rivers" or "beginnings of rivers" is meant is evident from what follows. See Rosenmuller.

† *Pison.* Robertson gives as the meaning of this *magna aquæ diffusio;* Gesenius, "water poured forth, overflowing." The latter thinks it to be the *Indus*, Josephus, the *Ganges*, Reland and Rosenmuller, the *Phasis* or *Araxes*. In none of these is there aught of certainty, and we mention them only to show the difficulty of coming to a conclusion on this point. The land of Havilah, Gesenius makes to be India. But with no certainty. Ham had a descendant of that name. (Gen. x. 7.) Shem also had (Gen. x. 29); but from which of these the land took its name we cannot say. Only, it is remarkable that next to Havilah, among the posterity of Shem, stands *Ophir*, who, in all likelihood, gave his name to the land of Ophir; which conjunction of the persons, Havilah and Ophir, would lead us to infer a juxta-position of the lands. In a paper read by Colonel Rawlinson at a Meeting of the Royal Geographical Society, in April last, "on the identification of the Biblical cities of Assyria, and on the geography of the lower Tigris," it was shown "that below the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates, four cities had been successively built, as the sea had retired before the deposit of alluvium, to serve as commercial emporia. These cities were the *Havilah* of Genesis, Beth Yakina of the Assyrian inscriptions, Teredon of Nebuchadnezzar, and Obillah of the Sassanians." This may lead us to place Havilah much nearer the Tigris and Euphrates than Gesenius would do. There is uncertainty also as to the meaning of *Bdellium*. Most seem to understand it as the pearl. See Rosenmuller, Gesenius, and Robertson, the last of whom throws out *crystal* also as perhaps

Digitized by Google

land there is the fine gold, with bdellium and the onyx stone, showing us what a land of wealth it must have been, its soil fruitful and its very rocks veined with gems and gold. To that land Job refers when he says, "The stones of it are the place of sapphires; and it hath dust of gold." (Job xxviii. 6.) To it also Ezekiel points when, speaking to the Prince of Tyre, he says, "Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God, every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold." * (2). † *Gihon.* It flowed round Ethiopia or Cush, and signifies a breaking forth of waters. More than this we cannot say of it. (3.) ‡ *Hiddekel.* It is said to go to the east of Assyria, and is certainly the *Tigris.* (4.) The *Euphrates.* This was too

its meaning. It is curious that the Seventy should have rendered it *ανθραξ*, a burning coal or fiery stone such as the carbuncle or ruby. Is there any connexion between this and the "stones of fire" mentioned in Ezekiel as the gems of Eden? There is the same difficulty as to the word translated onyx. The Sept. give it ὁ λίθος ὁ πράσινος, the emerald. It is more generally rendered *onyx* or *sardonyx*, on account of its supposed resemblance to the human nail,—though Robertson derives it from a word signifying, "igneo ardore præditus," and says it means, "lapis coruscis micans ignibus."

* It is remarkable that *fire* should be referred to in both the above passages. In Job it is, "under it is turned up as it were *fire.*" In Ezekiel it is, "thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stone of *fire.*" Had not fire-worship its seat in these regions?

† *Gihon.* It was the opinion of Josephus and of most ancient writers, that the Nile is meant. Gesenius makes it to be the Ethiopic Nile. There is little likelihood in these conjectures.

‡ *Hiddekel.* It signifies lightness or swiftness, something active, vehement, rapid, as does the word Tiger from which Tigris is derived. The *Euphrates* is said to derive its name from the sweetness of its taste. These two latter rivers are well ascertained; the two former are, we believe, not now in existence, and cannot be ascertained. We say this not only because no writer has ever been able to identify them; but because the whole four rivers had one common head which is nowhere now the case; and also because it is an ascertained fact that the Tigris has more than once been divided into *two* streams, perhaps more. If so, or if the Euphrates were so divided, we have the four rivers on the spot. Colonel Rawlinson thus states the point:—"After describing the ruins of Sekherieh, which, on various grounds, he identified with the Mesene of the Greeks, he went on to notice the bifurcation of the Tigris. This curious natural feature had been very accurately described both by Pliny and Stephen, and the Arab writers enabled us to connect those ancient notices with the modern geography of the country. The Cauchian plains of Pliny were shown to be the Coche of the Syrians and Jukha of the Arabs, while the Delos of Stephen was still preserved in the name of Diéleh (quite distinct from Dijleh), which the Bedouins of the present day apply to the dry bed of the Tigris, running by the ruins of Wasit. The Tigris had changed its course several times. At the period of the Christian era it was divided into two streams. Under the Sassanians, the left hand or eastern

Digitized by Google

well known to require minute description. It is spoken of elsewhere as "the river" (1 Kings iv. 21; Ps. lxxii. 8), the "great river" (Deut. i. 7), the "flood." (Josh. xxiv. 2.) It was the Euphrates that was to form one of the boundaries of Abraham's land, "unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt (Nile) to the great river, the river Euphrates." (Gen. xv. 18.) It was towards this river that Israel was commanded to turn their steps. (Deut. i. 7.) It was on the banks of this river that Israel sat down and wept, remembering Zion. (Ps. cxxxvii. 1.) It was in a hole of one of the rocks that skirt Euphrates that Jeremiah was to hide his girdle. (Jer. xiii. 4.) It was into Euphrates that Jeremiah was to cast the book containing Babylon's burden, with the stone bound to it, as the type of Babylon's more terrible plunge. (Jer. li. 63.) It was in the Euphrates that the Apocalyptic angels were bound, and on it that the sixth angel poured out his vial, drying up its waters, and preparing the way for the kings of the earth. (Rev. ix. 16; xvi. 12.) Babylon stood upon Euphrates,—Babylon the great enemy of Jehovah and his people, as well as the representative of their great enemy through all ages. Hard by Paradise, it may be on the very spot, was Satan permitted to rear his mighty citadel. He had driven man from that happy seat; he had blighted its beauty, and now, as if in defiance of God and man, he rears his city upon the faded flowers of Eden. One has asked,—

> "Having waste ground enough,
> Shall we desire to raze the sanctuary,
> And pitch our evils there?"

So was it with Satan, whether we regard Babylon as actually reared on the site of Paradise, or merely in some corner of the wider circle of Eden.* God's garden and Satan's city, close by each other, as if the latter were triumphing over the

branch was alone navigable. In the seventh year of the Hegira the right-hand or western branch was re-opened, while in the fifteenth century of our era the river took the form which it retains to the present day. The tract of country between the two arms, owing to its natural depression, had been always more or less subject to inundations, and boats had passed from Wasit to the Euphrates, along tracks artificially formed for them in the marshes. The character of the country was the same at the present day, and the Tigris from the tomb of Abdullah Ibn Ali to Kurna now ran in a channel which was formerly named the Abul Assad Canal, and which had been cleared out under the Caliph Mansur for the purposes of navigation."

* There are several passages which seem to show some connexion between Eden and the district around Babylon, as if the name of Eden had been retained in some parts. (Is. xxxvii. 12; Ezek. xxvii. 23.)

Digitized by Google

former! The emblem of the heavenly Paradise and the symbol of the great city, "Mother of harlots," city of Antichrist, side by side with each other! The earthly pattern of heavenly things passing away, and replaced by the abode of darkness, the cage of unclean beasts, the counterpart of Satan's own dark dwelling below!

But, what care and love God has shown towards man. What pains and cost to make him happy and comfortable! It is a father providing for his child, his first-born. God's desire was to bless. And that desire remains unchanged and undiminished. Our sin might have been expected to quench this desire, and to turn the blessing into a curse, the love into hate. It did so in the case of angels. It has not done so to us. He loves us still. He blesses and curses not. Paradise with all its beauty and abundance was but a faint expression of God's love when compared with his unspeakable gift, or with the more glorious Paradise yet in reserve. The earthly tree of life is as nothing compared with the heavenly original, which shall ere long be ours, when, as the "overcoming" ones, we shall eat of the "tree of life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." (Rev. ii. 7; xxii. 2, 14.)

Ver. 15.—"And the Lord God took the man and put him into (*Heb.*, placed, or set him in) the garden of Eden, to dress it (*Heb.*, to till it), and to keep it."

Having prepared the garden, the Lord God took the man and placed him in it, that he might till it and keep it. It was made for him and he for it, as the body is made for the soul and the soul for the body.* It was fruitful beyond anything we now know of, yet it was not *so* fruitful as to make any kind of care or cultivation needless. It was so fruitful as to occasion no toil nor weariness to the cultivator, yet not so fruitful as not to afford occasion to man's skill and watchfulness. No amount of skill or toil now can call up beauty, or verdure, or fruit, beyond a certain narrow limit, for man has to do with a rugged soil. But in Adam's case, the ground easily and gladly yielded its substance without limit to the most gentle toil. Nay, it was not *toil,* it was simple, pleasant occupation. No doubt the *amount* and kind of its actual fruitbearing was to depend upon himself; he was to regulate

* There is evidently a meaning in so much being spoken of and to the *man* alone, before the creation of the woman. He was to be the head and representative of the *race,* of the female as well as the male, which he would not so properly have been had Eve been created at the same time, or directly out of the ground, instead of out of the man. "Naturam igitur humanam in Adae persona condidit, atque inde formavit Hevam, ut fœmina tantum portio esset totius generis."—*Calvin in loc.*

this according to his wants and tastes; but still the fruit-bearing source was in the soil, imparted directly by the hand of God,—that all-quickening, all-fertilizing Spirit that brooded over the face of the deep. Afterwards that Spirit was grieved away from the soil by man's sin; but at first his power was most signally manifested in its fruitful richness. Man was lord of the soil and of all that trod it or grew on it, and his daily employments were to manifest his dominion,—not dominion over a rebellious earth, needing to be curbed or scourged into obedience, but dominion over a willing world, that stood eagerly awaiting his commands. All creation was, like a well-tuned instrument, ready made to his hand; and all that was needed on his part was simply the amount of happy effort needful to set its strings in motion, and bring out of them all the rich compass of their music. And if such was creation under the first Adam, what will it be under the second? Then truly shall the wilderness and the solitary place be glad, the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.*

Ver. 16.—"And the Lord God commanded the man saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest (or shalt) freely eat (*Heb.*, eating thou shalt eat, that is, thou shalt go on eating unhindered). 17. But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die (*Heb.*, dying thou shalt die, that is, thou shalt begin to die, and go on dying)."

We now come to the constitution under which God placed man. It was given in the form of a commandment,—"thou shalt," and "thou shalt not,"—an injunction and a prohibition. "The Lord God COMMANDED the man." There was as it were a moral *necessity* laid upon him to obey. This utterance of God's *will* imposed this necessity. It was not the mere declaration of certain consequences to arise from obedience or disobedience. It was such a declaration of *will* on the part of Jehovah as hedged him in on every side with the most overwhelming of all moral necessities. It was not indeed a necessity that left him without a free choice, but it was a necessity which gave a most preponderating bias to that free choice in the direction of obedience, even apart from

* Adam's tillage of the ground was of course not *toil;* but since the fall it has been hard and unceasing toil. Man has had to carry on a continual warfare with barrenness,—wringing from the soil its unwilling produce. In this process we notice that he keeps up the same *two circles* as before the fall, an outer and an inner,—Eden and Paradise,—seeking in general to fertilize and beautify the soil, yet always selecting some nook on which he bestows more special pains,—converting it into a *garden* or Paradise. In Sir Thomas Brown's Treatise on "the Garden of Cyrus," the reader may get an idea of these efforts.

Digitized by Google

consequences. Under a similar necessity, has God in his announcement of grace placed fallen man. He has not simply left to us a choice of the evil or the good. He has given utterance to his will. "This is his COMMANDMENT, that we believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ." A necessity is laid upon us. It is not a mere question as to our own woe or weal; it is a question of obedience or disobedience. Hence the inquiry so often made by those who have begun to learn what it is to be lost, but who as yet only dimly see how they may be saved,—"Am I at liberty to believe and to come to Christ as I am?" is one of the strangest that could be made. What should we have thought of Adam, had he asked, "Am I at liberty to obey God's commands?" What are we to think of the sinner who asks, "Am I at liberty to come to Christ?" At liberty to come! You *dare not* do otherwise, except you are prepared to defy God and disobey his commandment. At liberty to come! You are not at liberty to refuse. A necessity lies on you to come,—even that most solemn of all necessities, which springs from the declaration of the *will* of God. You can only be lost by acting all your life long in deliberate disobedience to the plainest of all commandments that ever came from the lips of God.

But let us consider the two points of this law given to Adam,—"Thou shalt," and "thou shalt not."

1. *The injunction.* "Of every tree of the garden, eating thou shalt eat." It is not "mayest eat," as our translation has it, but "shalt eat." As a sovereign's wishes are commands, so is it here. It is not a mere permission or invitation, but a command. And it is a peculiar form of speech,—the positive injunction that most truly comports with the authoritative dignity of a Sovereign Jehovah, as well as suits best the condition of the responsible creature by leaving no room for any doubt on his part as to what is the sovereign will of Him to whom all obedience is due.

2. *The prohibition.* One tree is forbidden, only one,—the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; and this with the added threatening of death for any breach of this solemn prohibition. What might be God's ultimate purpose regarding this tree, we cannot say. Nor can we fully comprehend the reasons for setting it in Paradise, within sight and reach of man. It was both in appearance and in its properties the most attractive of all the trees (Gen. iii. 6), the one which appealed most directly to man's intelligent nature. And had the prohibition been permanent and irreversible; had God meant that a tree possessing such qualities should never,

Digitized by Google

throughout man's whole future existence, be partaken of by him, it is not easy to see the reason either of the planting or the prohibiting of the tree. But take the prohibition as a temporary one, intended to prove man; suppose that after a certain time of obedience free access to the tree was to be allowed, then the difficulty lessens, if it does not wholly disappear.* Man was, ultimately, to eat freely of it, and to obtain all its singular benefits. By means of it he would rise in the scale of being, and obtain, in so far as a finite nature can, a participation of the divine knowledge of good and evil, without having to pass through that sore and long experience through which alone we now reach it. The eating of that tree would have done for him, through physical means, in some measure at least, what our participation of Christ, our eating of his body, does for us now, and will do yet more abundantly hereafter. Had man waited God's time, —had he exercised faith, he would have gotten all that the tree could give him ere long, and that in the way of obedience. "Believing" in God, he would not have "made haste." But he believed not; and made haste, as if resolved to have, whether through obedience or disobedience, all that the tree could yield him. It was to be proved whether he could trust God, and whether he loved God's will better than his own. Concerning this prohibition, we may note, (1.) *It was a needful prohibition.* Man must be kept in remembrance that he is not an absolute sovereign,—that he is but a vicegerent. He must be made to feel that there is another will in the universe besides his own, greater than his own, independent of his own, an absolutely sovereign will. (2.) *It was but one prohibition.* There was but one point in which his will and God's could come into collision. In great

* We cannot help thinking that this tree gets its name from the *physical* properties of its fruit. Venema and others, who strongly insist that the *tree of life* gets its name from its physical properties, yet reject the idea that the tree of knowledge has its name from a like cause,—simply because they cannot conceive how the body can so act upon the mind as that the latter shall be invigorated or elevated by means of the former. This, however, is no argument, as we have seen. To make it derive its name from the consequences of a *disobedient* eating of it, is surely a perversion of the words of the prohibition; it might have better been called in that case the "tree of death," as indeed some have insisted on naming it. Kennicott would paraphrase the name thus, "the tree which is the test of good and evil," that is, the tree by which God tried them to see whether they would choose good or evil, but this will not do. (See his ingenious *Dissertation on the Tree of Life*, p. 25.) It surely means some particular tree whose fruit had certain properties, so operative upon the soul of man as to make him grow in the knowledge or discernment of good and evil.

Digitized by Google

lovingkindness God had made it so. Man was not burdened, or fretted, or perplexed, with many points of this kind. *Only one!* How gracious! How considerate, as if God sought to make man's trial the least possible, so as to leave him without excuse if he should disobey. (3.) *It was a simple prohibition.* It had nothing intricate or dark about it. There was nothing mysterious about it, nothing in which man could mistake, nothing which could leave room for the question, Am I obeying or not? It was distinct beyond the possibility of mistake. (4.) *It was a visible prohibition.* It was connected with something both visible and tangible. It was not inward, but outward. It was not a thing of faith, but of sight. Everything about it was palpable and open—the tree, the fruit, the place, the threat, the consequences. (5.) *It was an easy prohibition.* Man could not say it was hard to keep. He was only to refrain from eating one fruit. Being a negative, not a positive requirement, it reduced obedience to its lowest form and easiest terms. Hence man's sin was the greater. He was wholly inexcusable. (6.) *It was enforced by a most solemn penalty.* It began with a declaration of God's *will*, and it ended with the proclamation of the penalty—*death.* How much this expression includes has been often disputed. There is no need of this. In the day that man ate of the tree he came under condemnation—he became a death-doomed man; the sentence went forth against him.* Grace came in afterwards, and suspended the full execution of the sentence; but still the sentence went out—"dying thou shalt die." That *temporal* death, as it is called—the dissolution of soul and body—was the *first* thing contained in this sentence, there can be little doubt. Not as if the sentence rested there. Temporal death was but the entrance into that gloomy region of condemnation within which all things terrible await the sinner. Temporal death was to be, not then only, but ever after, the *visible pledge*

* "Tunc morti addictus fuit Adam, et mors regnum suum in eo inchoavit."—*Calvin.* "Sinners are actually on the road to death and destruction from that moment, and a separation takes place between them and life."—*Nitsch's* "System of Christian Doctrine," part ii., sec. 2. From the moment that man sinned he came under the curse;—he was under doom. He commenced dying. This corresponds exactly to the way in which the repeal of the curse is declared, "he that believeth *hath* everlasting life." From the moment he believes he gets possession of this life, though the *full* life is reserved for another state; and as the first stroke of the sentence inflicted on Adam was *condemnation,* so the first part of its removal in believing, is "no condemnation:" and as the close and seal of the curse, in Adam's case, was bodily death, so the consummation of it, in the case of the saint, is resurrection.

Digitized by Google

or mark of the sentence. Hence it is that we read, "it is appointed unto men once to die;" in which words the Apostle refers to the primeval sentence—*man's once dying*—and shows how this sentence was fulfilled in the *once dying* of the substitute. (Heb. ix. 28.) This death brought with it all manner of infinite ills and woes. It brought with it, or included in it, condemnation, wrath, misery, separation from God—all endless—all immediate—all irreversible, had not free love come in—had "grace not reigned through righteousness, unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." The sentence was, "the soul that sinneth it shall die." But "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."

Ver. 18.—"And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; * I will make him an help meet for him."

The previous verses have described the preparation of man's dwelling; the eighteenth and those that follow contain a minute detail of the formation of his help-meet. In the case of the animal creation, male and female were created together. Not so with man. There must be an interval between his creation and that of the woman, just as there was to be an interval between the incarnation and the in-gathering of the Church. In all things pertaining to man there must be something more special than in other beings. The work must be done more deliberately, step by step, that each thing done may be seen *in itself* before it is seen in its connexion with other parts of creation. Man is created *alone* at first, that he may stand forth as the great model of God's workmanship, and that our eye may be fixed on him as the representative of our nature. He is the great head of humanity—its root—its fountain. In him, thus placed before us alone, we have the intimation of God's purpose regarding man's nature, and man's rule over the earth. Besides, he is thus made to feel his loneliness—his need of another like himself. He feels as if one half of his nature were awanting. He stood indeed amid a glorious world—a world bursting with fresh glad beauty on every side, and teeming with boundless life—but he stood alone! There was no one like himself—no soul to meet his soul, in all its buoyant outgoings. He stood

"An exile amid splendid desolation,
A prisoner with infinity surrounded."†

He had, it is true, God for his companion; but this was not

* M. Stuart gives, as the literal rendering here, "not good is the being of man in his separation," that is, in his solitude.—*Chrestomathy*, p. 138.

† Montgomery's "Pelican Island."

Digitized by Google

all that was needed, as God himself here testifies. There must be one like himself—in whom there will be more of equality and sympathy and nearness—one neither too high nor too low for him. "I will make (says God) an help meet for him." God only understands his case, and can satisfy the cravings of his spirit for the intercourse of a spirit like his own. I will make for him an helper, corresponding to him—another self—his counterpart—the very being to fill up the void within him.*

Ver. 19.—"And (or now) out of the ground the Lord God formed (or had formed) every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air (Heb., heaven); and brought them unto Adam (or to the man) to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam (or the man) called every living creature, that was the name thereof. 20 And Adam gave names to all (the) cattle, and to the fowl of the air (the heaven), and to every beast of the field."

God now proceeds to shew man the exact point where the void lay. Adam had been made to feel that void, but God's object is to place him in circumstances such as shall lead him step by step to the seat of the unsatisfied longing within. Accordingly, God brings before him all the creatures which He had made, that Adam, in his choice may have the whole range of creation.† Adam surveys them all. He sees by instinctive wisdom the nature and properties of each, so that he can affix names to all in turn. His knowledge is large and full. It has come direct from God, just as his own being

* עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, literally "a helper as over against him"—corresponding to him. The Sept. has it βοηθὸν κατ' ἀυτὸν in this verse, but at v. 20, where the words are the same, it has ὅμοιος αὐτῷ. The Vulgate makes it "adjutorium simile sibi," which Isidore Clarius, in his amended edition of the Vulgate (1542), turns into "adjutorium opportunum." Coverdale renders it "an helpe to bear him company." The Hebrew expression seems to denote the correspondency or fitting in of the one nature to the other—the perfect *adaptation* of the woman to the man. (See Robertson's "Clavis," and Gesenius' "Lexicon," and M. Stuart.) Stockius gives "correlatum" as the sense. Milton has brought out part of this idea in the fourth book of "Paradise Lost:"—

"Tho' both,
Not equal, as their sex not equal seemed:
For contemplation he and valour formed,
For softness she and sweet attractive grace;
He for God only, she for God in him."

And a writer of the last generation puts it thus: "Is not man himself (humanity) split into two parts, man for condescending love, woman for reverent love?"

† "Denique adducta sunt animalia ad Adam, ut videret quid vocaret ea, non ipse aliqua curiositate ductus est ut videret ea."—*Bernard, Sermones.*

Digitized by Google

had come. It is not discovery, it is not learning, it is not experience, it is not memory, it is intuition. By intuition he knew what the wisest king in after ages only knew by searching.* Solomon, we read, "spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." (1 Kings iv. 33.) But Adam's knowledge went far beyond this. In the case both of Adam and of Solomon, we see what man shall yet attain to—what wide-spread knowledge shall be theirs who are one with that second Adam in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. From these instances we see not merely the folly but the sin of those who depreciate science, as if it were the handmaid of ungodliness, and the result of the fall. Sorely misused has science been; sadly has it oftentimes risen up between the soul and God—between sinful man and the incarnate Son—between the intellect of the learned and the Gospel of the grace of God. Fearfully has it wrought, as a deadly poison to the human spirit, through the workings of pride and self-sufficiency, and idolatry of the reason. But notwithstanding all these results, let us hold fast the truth which Adam's wondrous attainments teach us, that such knowledge is in itself most truly and surely good—not evil.

Ver. 20.—"But for Adam there was not found an help meet for him."

No counterpart,—no being to fill up the void within him, was to be found in all these. There was no response from any one of them to the deep feelings of his breast. They were too far asunder from him. Their nature was not in harmony or sympathy with his. The two extremities of being had thus been presented to Adam,—God himself on the one hand, and the animal creation on the other. In neither of these can a help-meet be found. The one is too far above him, the other too much beneath him. A being must be found liker and nearer himself. The whole creation, perfect as it was, yet contained nothing for true and loving companionship. Men may speak of fellowship with nature, in its various forms and orders of life,—of finding sympathies in the breeze, the cloud, the wave, the rock, the flower; but all this is but the exaggeration of sentiment or poetry.

* Some have asserted that man *rose* by the *fall*,—that is, that he gained in intellect what he lost in spiritual character. There is no proof in Scripture for such a statement. The results of the fall were unmingled loss, both intellectually and morally.

Digitized by Google

In all creation, animate or inanimate, there is no fellow, no companion for man.

Ver. 21.—"And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; 22 And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. 23 And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. 24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be one flesh."

God now proceeds to supply the void, but in such a way as shall make man feel God's design and meaning. The peculiar process adopted by the Creator in forming the help-meet was to intimate to man the nature of the companion presented to him, and the closeness of the tie between them. Adam was thrown into a deep sleep, which made him insensible to pain,* though perhaps not unconscious of what was passing. When in this state, God took one of his ribs, and fashioned out of it a woman, healing the wound at once. Then God brought her to Adam, revealing at the same time to him the history of her formation. Adam recognizes Jehovah's gracious purpose in this; he feels the void supplied; he acknowledges the oneness between himself and her; he gives her a name expressive of this. Her name is to be woman, *Isha*, derived from his own, *Ish*, man. Then follows the historian's statement regarding the oneness of the two, and man's duty to make this tie paramount. The conjugal relationship is closer than the filial. All other bonds must yield to this, however sacred and tender they may be. The words of the twenty-fourth verse are evidently not the words of Adam himself, but the comment of Moses upon the words of Adam.† And a greater than

* "Qualis et ille sopor dicendus sit fuisse vel credendus quem Dominus immisit in Adam, in quo sine sensu omnino doloris, in mulierem ædificandam costa sublata est de latere dormientis."—*Bernard*, Serm. Augustine sets aside this view, and gives *mystical* not *physical* reasons for the sleep. The Latin poem on Genesis, ascribed to Tertullian and Cyprian, thus states it:—

"Ilicet irriguo perfundit lumina somno,
Mollius ut vulsa formetur femina costa,
Atque artus mixtu gemino substantia firmet."

And Milton,—"Mine eyes he closed, but open left the cell
Of fancy, my internal sight; by which,
Abstract, as in a trance, methought I saw
Though sleeping," &c.—*Par. Lost*, b. viii., 460.

† Jerome thinks otherwise, for he puts the words into Adam's lips, and speaks of him as the first prophet,—"Primus homo et primus vates Adam, hoc de Christo et ecclesiâ prophetavit, quod reliquerit Dominus noster

Digitized by Google

Moses has enlarged this comment:—"From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Mark x. 6.)

With one or two further remarks, we leave this passage.

1. *As to Adam's sleep.* It was a heavy or deep sleep. It was a sleep sent directly from God. It was a sleep for a special end. In the case of Abraham and Daniel we see the same thing. (Gen. xv. 12; Dan. viii. 18; x. 9.) A deep sleep from God fell on both these when God designed to communicate visions to them. In their case, God caused them to sleep that he might shew them what was to be done; in the case of Adam, that he might actually do the thing. In both instances, the individuals were rendered unconscious to outward things by that which we call sleep, and in that state God took possession of them,—in Abraham's and Daniel's case of the soul, in Adam's of the body. It would seem to be intimated that, not until Adam had been brought into that state which approaches nearest to death, could God accomplish his design. There must be sleep in the first Adam ere God can take out of him the ordained spouse; and there must be death in the second Adam ere God can take out of him the chosen Bride. In this way there might be something prefigurative in Adam's sleep.*

2. *As to the taking of woman out of man.* As it was God

atque Salvator patrem suum Deum et matrem suam cœlestem Hierusalem, et venerit ad terras, propter suum corpus Ecclesiam, et de suo eam latere fabricatus est."—*On Eph.* v. 32. "Quod (verbum) Moses Adamo tribuit tanquam prophetanti," says *Fr. Balduin* (Wittemberg Professor of Theology), in his bulky Commentary on the Pauline Epistles, p. 944. "Postquam Adamus accepit conjugem . . . plenus Spiritu Sancto fert leges conjugii universæ posteritati, erumpens in hæc verba," &c.—*Rungius*, in Gen., p. 147. In spite of such authorities, however, we still feel a difficulty in putting these words into Adam's mouth. The subsequent verse is evidently from the historian, not from Adam, and why may not this also?

* This subject was, of course, likely to be a favourite one with the Fathers. Their allusions to it are without number. Thus Augustine, "Quando dormivit in cruce implebat quod significatum erat in Adam, quia cum dormiret Adam, costa illi detracta est et Eva facta est."—*On Ps.* cxxvii. And *Gotschalc*, the Augustine or Calvin of the ninth century, writes, "Eva de Adam, sic Ecclesia de Christo; et sicut Adamo dormiente inde formata est Ecclesia, sic Christo dormiente in cruce, inde formata est ecclesia."—*Sermon on the Nativity.* Tertullian thus writes, "Somnus Adæ mors erat Christi dormituri in mortem et de injuria perinde lateris ejus, vera mater viventium figuraretur Ecclesia."—*De Anima*, ch. xliii.

Digitized by Google

that caused Adam to sleep, so it was God himself that took the rib out of him. Thus God shews himself to us as at once the great purposer and the great doer of all things. Second causes, as we speak, are but an expression of the tools or instruments which He makes use of in carrying out his designs. He lays us to sleep each night and he awakens us each morning with his own loving hand. He is the God of our nights and of our days. It was from Adam that God took the substance which he meant to fashion into woman, indicating that, as man was formed first, and as woman sprang from man, so man is to be her head. He from the dust, she from him. *He* directly from the Former's hand, *she* indirectly, and through *him*. "Adam," says the Apostle, "was first formed, then Eve" (1 Tim. ii. 13); therefore, says he, she is "not to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." Thus, again, he states the gradation: (1) the head of the woman is the man, (2) the head of the man is Christ, (3) the head of Christ is God. (1 Cor. xi. 3.) Farther he adds that "the woman is the glory (or ornament) of the man," for, says he, "the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man; neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." * (1 Cor. xi. 8, 9.) Such is God's order of things; such his assignment of place and rank to the creatures which he has made. We may be sure that there is a reason for this gradation, not merely a *typical*, but a *natural* one, whether we fully understand it or not. We cannot alter this law, and be blameless. We cannot reverse it, and not suffer loss. The construction of our world's fabric is far too delicate and complex for man to attempt the slightest change without dislocating the whole. One star displaced, one planet thrown off its orbit, will confound the harmonies of space, and strew the firmament with the wrecks of the universe; so one law lost sight of or set at nought will mar the happy order of God's living world below. In one age or nation man treads down woman as a slave; in another he idolizes her, and sings of her as of a goddess; in both cases inflicting a social wrong upon the

* We may notice here how all the different conditions of womanhood are made use of by God as setting forth some peculiar aspect of his Church:—(1) *Virgin.* 2 Cor. xi. 2; Rev. xiv. 4. (2) *Betrothed.* Hos. ii. 19; 2 Cor. xi. 2. (3) *Wife.* Rev. xix. 7, xxi. 9. (4) *Travailing.* Rev. xi. 2. (5) *Desolate and forsaken.* Gal. iv. 27. (6) *Mother.* Gal. iv. 26. (7) *Barren.* Isa. liv. 1. (8) *Widow.* Luke xviii. 3; Isa. liv. 4. And thus one of the Fathers illustrates the idea: "*Sponsa* est (ecclesia) quia inhaeret Christo; *Mater* est, quia fœcundatur a Christo; *Virgo,* quia incorrupta perseverat in Christo."—*Fulgentius.* Epist.

Digitized by Google

race—in the latter case as truly as in the former; and who can say how deep an injury, both spiritual and social, has been wrought, and how fatal an influence has been sent forth, by that fond sentimentalism which, impregnating our poetry, and, coursing like fever through the veins of youth, not only "costs the fresh blood dear," but saps the whole social system, nay, propagates a principle of subtle ungodliness and creature-worship, in its praise of woman's beauty and idolatry of woman's love.

3. *As to the taking of woman from the side of man.* From neither extremity of Adam's body did God take the woman, signifying that she was neither to be man's lord, nor man's drudge, but his fellow, only with this inferiority, that she was taken out of him, and therefore he was to be her head. From that part which lies nearest his heart did woman come. She was not so much to partake of man's intellectual as of his loving nature. It was not from man's thinking forehead or sinewy arm that she sprang, but from those parts where it may be said there is the least of *man* to be found. From the region where the warm blood flows, and the heart throbs, and the pulses take their rise, and the fountain of life wells up, did woman come. From that quarter of man's being where, in all ages, affection has been conceived to make its home, where joy and sorrow have their flowings and reflowings, where fear and hope are each hour sinking and swelling, did woman come. The fragrant plumage of the turtle tells us out of what spice-grove she has come. So does woman's tender nature of itself declare that it is from the region of the kindly and the gentle that she has been brought forth. As it was out of the bosom of the Father that the Eternal Son came down to us laden with the Father's love; as it was out of the bosom of the Son that the Church came forth, at once the object and the reflection of his mighty love; so it was out of man's side,—man's bosom,—that she came forth who was to be at once the embodiment of his gentler affections, and the being round whom these affections were to cling. And as it was on the High Priest's breast—his place of love—that the names of Israel rested, in jewelled splendour, so is it on man's breast that woman is to rest;—aye, and so is it hereafter, on the breast of the eternal Bridegroom that the Church is to repose, in more than earthly glory, in that day when his "left hand shall be under her head, and his right hand shall embrace" her; when she shall be "set as a seal upon his heart, as a seal upon his arm" for ever.

Digitized by Google

4. *As to the making of woman from a rib of man.** One of those protecting circles which prevents the sinking in of the flesh upon the heart, and which gives the heart full room to play, was to be taken out entire, that out of it woman might be formed. The bone and the flesh were both taken —the softer and more solid parts of man's body—that it might be seen how truly she was of man's very nature, though in some respects differing. Not a separate being formed out of the dust, in which man could not recognise a part of himself, but a being thoroughly identified with him; not merely like him, but one with him, so that her absence would be the absence of a part of himself,—a blank, a void, without whom he would be incomplete.† This taking out a *rib* in order to form the woman, suggests very much the idea that would have been called up had a cedar plank, or a piece of gold, been taken out of the "holiest of all" in the temple, to fashion into one of the vessels of the sanctuary. A vessel formed in such a way would be very different in the eyes of Israel from one formed of cedar direct from Lebanon, or gold direct from Ophir. It could not fail to remind them of the sacred place from which its materials were taken, and it would be for ever associated in their minds with all that "the holy of holies" suggested to an Israelite. Thus woman, taken from the very shrine of man's corporeal sanctuary (for the Apostle teaches us to call our bodies temples, 1 Cor. vi. 19), is linked with all the sacred or tender associations that are called up by that well-known but mysterious word— the heart!

5. *As to the making of the woman.* The expression is a very peculiar one. It is neither of the two former that have been already employed,—"created" or "made." It is, literally, "builded." The word is a very common one, occurring about 400 times, but here only in so peculiar a sense. It is the word used in reference to the building of a city, a house, a family, a temple, a throne, an altar, and such like. And there is surely some signification in applying such a word to the formation of woman.‡ Of man it is said he

* Una mulier, una costa," says Tertullian. ("Ad Uxorem," b. i. sec. 2.) "Tulit *unam* de costis ejus; quare non nisi una mulier uni viro socianda est."—*Gotschalc.* Sermo xxvi.

† Hence some have supposed that the word כַּלָּה, a *bride*, is derived from the woman's being the filling up or *perfecting* of man's nature. (See Parkhurst's Lexicon, and Wemyss's "Key to the Symbolical Language of Scripture.") The Greeks used τέλος, end or perfection, to denote marriage.

‡ Calvin's idea of the use of the word here is, that it supposes man to be an incomplete edifice hitherto; "consulto etiam usus est Moses ædifi-

Digitized by Google

was *made*, of woman she was *builded*. Now man was the type of Christ, and of the latter, in reference to his human nature, it might be said simply he was "made,"—formed at once. But the woman signifies the Church, taken out of the wounded side of her dying Lord. And of the Church it is often said she is "builded;" "in whom," says the Apostle, "all the *building*, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy *temple* in the Lord; in whom ye also are *builded together* for an *habitation* of God, through the Spirit" (Eph. ii. 21, 22); and again, "for the edifying"—literally, the *building*—"of the body of Christ." (Eph. iv. 12.) By the term "building," applied to the formation of Eve, God has thought fit to shadow forth to us the process by which, age after age, the Church (which is the second Eve) was to be fashioned into a help-meet or counterpart for Christ, the second Adam; * yet as the second Adam was far more glorious than the first, so does the second Eve, taken out of His pierced breast, far transcend the first, God in all respects bestowing more cost and pains upon the new creation than upon the old. For redemption has brought in, not simply a new order of things, but one far higher than that which it is designed to replace: the one being earthly, the other heavenly; the one fleshly, the other spiritual; the one human, the other divine. And thus the Church, Christ's chosen Bride, springing from his smitten side, is "builded;"—builded by the same Almighty hands that built the wondrous heavens; builded, as was the Temple of old, without sound of axe or hammer; builded, at once as the *City* of the Lamb's special habitation, and the *Companion* for his dearest fellowship, without whom this goodly universe would have been incomplete to him; for even in it, though renewed and glorified, it would have been found that it was "not good for Him to be alone." For Him no help-meet could have been found, had not the Father provided this "glorious Church," and had not He himself, in the greatness of his longing for that help-meet, consented to sleep the deep sleep of death upon the cross, that thus *she* might be taken out of Him, whose beauty, as seen pictured in the Father's purpose, had already "ravished his heart"

candi verbo, ut doceret in mulieris persona tandem absolutum fuisse humanum genus, quod prius inchoato aedificio simile erat." Others, he says, refer it to the incompleteness of the *family* (which is often called *a house*) without the woman. And this he in part agrees with.

* "Non solum de costâ Adam, in typum Ecclesiæ semel ædificavit Evam, sed quotidie, credentes et membra corporis sui ædificat, et de terris ad cœlum levat."—*Jerome on Amos* ix. 6.

Digitized by Google

(Song iv. 9); whose presence could alone make even the better Paradise complete; and union to whom, throughout eternity, was what his heart desired. (John xv. 9, xvii. 23—26.)

6. *As to the closing up of the flesh instead of what was taken out.* Adam was not to be the loser in any way or sense, but the gainer. All deficiency was replaced, all loss supplied. God would teach him the nature of woman and the object of her creation (wrapping up in this also a type of things to come), but He would teach it in a way that would not leave man the sufferer. Jacob's lesson was to be learned by "halting on his thigh" all his life after; but Adam's was to be learned by looking at his help-meet, and then while remembering how she had been "builded," to feel that she had cost him nothing beyond the sleep into which he had been so mysteriously thrown. A sleep but nothing more,—this was all the price for a boon so precious! No abiding pain, or loss, or weakness. He was still the same Adam as when he came from the hands of his Maker. Neither has the second Adam suffered loss for us. It did indeed cost Him much to redeem us. It cost him a darker, sadder, and more troubled sleep than Adam's. But it is all over now! He retains nothing of the weakness, or sorrow, or darkness, of his low estate. He is not less the King of glory because he was once the humbled Jesus. He does indeed appear in heaven a Lamb "as it had been slain;" He may, perhaps, retain the wounds of the cross; but more than this He does not. All other traces of his humiliation are erased. He has lost nothing by the Bride that He has gained. Nay, He has won much; for his weakness, sorrow, shame, when here, have bought for Him new strength, and gladness, and glory. Hence the song of angels, "Worthy is THE LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." (Rev. v. 12.)

7. *As to the woman's introduction to the man.* "He brought her unto the man." God Himself, as if standing in a father's room, and acting the father's part, brings the bride to the bridegroom. As a beloved daughter He presents her to her future husband. He joined their hands and pronounced over them the marriage-blessing (ch. i. 28), "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth."* A stranger, and yet no

* Marriage was thus instituted *before* the fall; yet it remains *after* the fall, a standing ordinance. No precept concerning it was given afterwards till the time of Moses, yet it remained in force, and Christ appeals to this marriage transaction in the unfallen state as *the* basis of the law of marriage. The same with the Sabbath. It was given to unfallen man, yet

Digitized by Google

stranger,—a part of himself, the filling up of his being, she was brought before him, and knit to him in inseparable bonds. And it is thus that the true Eve speaks of herself in the Song, "The King hath *brought* me into his chambers" (ch. i. 4); and again, "He *brought* me to the banqueting house." (Ch. ii. 4.) Of her also it is written, "She shall be *brought* unto the King in raiment of needlework" (Ps. xlv. 14), and again, that she is "prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." (Rev. xxi. 2.) One of her special characteristics is that she is "given" of the Father to the Son; and in that day when He comes in his glory she shall be caught up to meet Him in the air, and be brought into his presence by the Father, there to have the marriage service celebrated, and as a "chaste virgin" (2 Cor. xi. 2), to be presented to Him to whom she has been so long betrothed. Then shall that song be sung to which all the new creation shall echo, "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready; and to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." (Rev. xix. 7, 8.)

8. *As to Adam's recognition of her.** Whether by revelation or consciousness we know not; but Adam knows the woman thus brought to him and calls her woman, as being a part of man. This is his response to God's introduction of her. He acknowledges the oneness and receives her as himself. We have God's consent in bringing, the woman's consent in coming, and now we have Adam's consent in receiving. Thus is the marriage completed by the full concurrence of all. And so is it with the second Adam too. He receives and owns his Bride. He welcomes her as indeed part of Himself, one with Himself. "Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he

the law remains in force after the fall, though there is no precept regarding it till Moses. And when that precept comes it points back at once to the first institution of the rest-day. Our Lord does the same,—"The Sabbath was made for man."

* The words in the original are peculiar. It is not simply, "this is *now* bone of my bones;" the word translated *now*, means "this time" or "this turn," as if he had said, "God has brought the animals to me one by one, and I have not found a counterpart to me,—but *this time* I have,—the being that He has brought to me *this time* is just such an one as I needed." Bishop Kidder's explanation will not stand, "for this once, as she should be otherwise produced afterwards."—*Commentary on the Books of Moses*, vol. i., p. 11. *Rungius* comes nearer it when he translates it *nunc tandem*, now at length, and adds that it is the voice of one exulting and giving thanks to God for the boon conferred (p. 144).

Digitized by Google

is not ashamed to call them brethren." (Heb. ii. 11.) And again it is written, "We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." (Eph. v. 30.*) And thus recognising the mysterious oneness between Himself and his Bride He expresses his admiration of her beauty, as the "fairest among women" (Song i. 8), "All glorious within" (Ps. xlv. 13), whilst she with joy responds and speaks of Him as "fairer than the children of men." (Ps. xlv. 2.) "Behold, thou art fair, my love,—thou art all fair, there is no spot in thee" (Song. iv. 7), is the utterance of his admiring love of her, while she replies, "My beloved is white and ruddy, the chiefest among ten thousand, his head is as the most fine gold; his locks are bushy and black as a raven; his countenance is as Lebanon, excellent as the cedars; his mouth is most sweet; yea, he is altogether lovely." (Song v. 16.) And in the happy consciousness of possessing Him and his love she gives vent to the deep feeling of her satisfied soul, "My beloved is mine and I am his, he feedeth among the lilies until the day break and the shadows flee away." (Ch. ii. 16.)

All this transaction took place in silence,—without noise and without violence. In the silence of deep sleep † (it might be midnight too), the Lord wrought his work. It might seem a deed of pain and violence to man. But no. There was the unconscious opening of the side,—the gentle abstraction of the needed part,—the tender and unfelt healing of the wound!

* Theodoret commenting on the verse in Ephesians, applies it thus,—"As Eve was formed (επλασθη) out of Adam, so are we out of the Lord Christ; for we are buried with him in baptism and rise again with him; and we eat his body and we drink his blood." And then referring to a man's leaving his father, &c., he applies it thus, "He (Christ) leaving his Father above (τὸν ἀνω πατὲρα), was joined to the Church" (τῆ ἐκκλησιᾳ συνήφθη). We may notice here that while in the passage before us it is the *man* that is said to leave his father's house, not the *wife*, yet this latter is evidently understood; for if the man must do it much more the wife. Our readers also will remember in the 45th Psalm, it is the *bride* that is exhorted to forget her father's house.

† May we not be allowed to suppose that man was created early on the sixth day;—during the day he reviewed and named the creatures,—then as it drew towards evening he fell into the deep trance-like sleep, and on awakening on the Sabbath morning, he saw and welcomed his mysterious help-meet? On that Sabbath dawn it was that "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy,"—chanting the bridal song;—and on the world's great Sabbath-dawn shall that song be sung over Paradise regained, as the Bride is seen descending, "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." (Rev. xxi. 3.)

Digitized by Google

How strange the work, yet how silent the doing! And how like the noiseless building of the Temple on Moriah, on which no sound of axes or hammers was ever heard. How like the process that is now going on in this world for the building of the "living Temple!" The work advances in silence. No uproar, no shouting, no clamour. From day to day it moves on noiselessly. Stone after stone is cut from the rude rock, hewn and polished,—ready to be fitted into the glorious fabric. Member after member is gathered in and added to the mystic body,—the Bride, the Lamb's wife! All by an invisible hand and by a process of which the world knows nothing! And when this midnight is over, and the world's great Sabbath dawns, then in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, shall this prepared Bride, in full maturity of being and bloom of resurrection beauty, stand forth to view, when the Bridegroom's voice shall be heard, "Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away, for lo! the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth, the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land." (Song ii. 10.)

Ver. 25.—"**And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.**"

There they stood, just as they came from the hands of God. They did not need to blush; they felt no shame. It is sin that has connected nakedness and shame together. No sin, no shame. There is no blush upon an angel's brow. Unfallen man had the unashamed nakedness of innocence; but with the fall this has passed away, not to be returned to even under redemption, but to be replaced by something higher, the glorious raiment of a righteousness that is unfading and divine. Unfallen man needed no covering and asked for none; but fallen man, under the bitter consciousness of the unworthy and unseemly condition to which sin has reduced him, as unfit for God or angels or man to look upon, cries out for covering,—covering such as will hide his shame even from the eye of God. Hence He who undertook to provide this covering, must bear the shame. And he has borne it,—all the shame of hanging naked on the cross,—the shame of a sinner,—the shame of being made the song of the drunkard,—the shame of being despised and rejected of men, —the shame of being treated as an outcast, one unfit for either God or man to look upon,—unfit not only to live, but even to die within the gates of the holy city. (Heb. xiii. 11, 12.)

Digitized by Google

All that shame has He borne for us, that we might inherit his glory. He stooped to the place of shame below that we might obtain the place of honour in the better Paradise above.*

Thus walked our first parents amid the groves of a Paradise that had not then been lost. Thus dwelt they in its bowers as a home, and worshipped in it as a sanctuary. † For with them the family mansion was the temple of their God. These were one, ere man had sinned. The entrance of sin divided these. Nor did grace, though coming in so largely and so swiftly, unite them again. From that day onward they have been separate. But the time is at hand when they shall be again united as in Paradise; and in the new Jerusalem, the Church shall find at once her temple and her home. Even now we anticipate this blessed reunion; for faith brings us into the Holy of holies, there to worship and to dwell. We pitch our tents beside the mercy seat and under the shadow of the glory. In the innermost shrine of the temple is the Church's proper home. And when we pass from the visions of faith into the realities of possession and enjoyment, we shall find the same happy union of the home and the temple. In the Jerusalem beneath the separation may be still kept up, but in the Jerusalem above, the palace and the temple are one; for as it is the Lord God Almighty that is to

* In the preceding exposition we have taken no notice of the Rationalistic absurdities, or rather profanities, which have been fastened upon this chapter. As we believe that it contains not a human but a divine history, and as we are *Bibliolaters* enough to believe that the *words,* as well as the *thoughts* are divine, we have endeavoured to enter minutely into all its statements, not doubting that they are all literalities. If our readers wish to see how Scripture can be philosophized into unmeaning nothingness and puerility, they can read a Treatise by David Julius Pott (1796), on the 2d and 3d Chapters of Genesis, in which he endeavours to show that the whole is a "philosophema mythicum." He is worse than either Dathe or Rosenmuller. The admirable works of Hengstenberg and Havernick on the Pentateuch, should be studied on these points.

† The long preserved traditions of Paradise led men in after ages to worship in *groves* and under trees, and even to construct their temples in imitation of these. A Gothic cathedral is just a petrified forest-shrine,—the pillared trees shooting up on each side, and the interwoven branches embracing over head and forming the roof. God seems to have taken special care to suppress this idea, both on account of the heathen abominations done in groves, and also because *his* time for a return to Eden worship was not yet come. Hence both the tabernacle and temple have nothing of the kind about them, save a few engravings of palm-trees on the walls.

Digitized by Google

be the temple there, so it is in the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb that we are to abide, we in Him and He in us. It is the bosom of the Father that is to be our dwelling for ever.

That promised inheritance of the saints was prefigured by Adam's Paradise, with this difference, that as the second Adam far transcends the first, so shall the Paradise of the second Adam far excel and outshine the Paradise of the first. The glory of the terrestrial is one, but the glory of the celestial is another. The glory of unfallen creation is one, but the glory of restored creation is another. The glory of earth, standing *alone* in its beauty is one, but the glory of earth and heaven united,—of earth and heaven reflecting and augmenting each other's splendour, is another. Yet still the earthly and the heavenly have their common features by which the one is known to be a copy of the other, just as the tabernacle was a copy of heavenly things shown to Moses on the mount. In the Apocalyptic picture of the "inheritance of the saints in light," we can trace the likeness between the two in the main aspect of the outline, though the filling up may somewhat differ. This *unlikeness* certainly we notice, that in the one there was no building whatsoever, in the other there is a magnificent city. Yet this city is embosomed in a gorgeous Paradise; and it is built of the various gems for which the ancient Paradise was noted; as if God had for these many ages hedged in and veiled the sacred spot, that He might enlarge and beautify it after a fashion which eye had not seen; nay, that he might rear within its bowers and out of its rich mines, a city worthy of Himself and of that Son who was to be its Lord, and of that company, redeemed by blood, who were to inhabit it, so that when at last the fence is taken down and the covering removed, there stands forth to view, not the ancient Paradise, for the dwelling of "the man and his wife," but the "many mansions" (John xiv. 2), the "prepared city" (Heb. xi. 16), the city of gems and gold, for the habitation of the nobler heirs, the great multitude that no man can number. *

In the midst of the street of this city there re-appears the

* Besides various references scattered through the Fathers, Basil has a whole discourse, "Concerning Paradise,"—a little in the style of Hervey's "Meditations," partly descriptive, partly sentimental, and partly allegorical, which has this solemn conclusion, "when thou hast considered all these things, give glory to God, for to Him all the glory belongs, even to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen."

Digitized by Google

tree of life; just as the former tree of life had been "in the midst of the garden," and just as the pot of manna (sole memorial for ages of the tree of life), was in the midst of the ark. (Heb. ix. 4.) Of the tree of knowledge no trace is to be found, as if no memorial of man's sin were to remain,—or as if the interdict being removed there was no longer any need to specify it,—or as if it had been entirely superseded by Him in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,—or as if knowledge and life, once separated, had now become so entirely one that the tree of life might represent both,—for "this is *life* eternal that they might *know* the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent."* Adam in Paradise had the tree of life; Israel in the wilderness had the manna (angels' food, Ps. lxxviii. 25, as temporary supply till the true bread should come down); but the Church, in the New Jerusalem, is to have the more glorious tree, of which the former was but a terrestrial shadow. Beyond "the mountain of myrrh" and the "hill of frankincense," when the day has broken and the shadows fled; beyond Lebanon, and Amana, and Shenir, and Hermon; beyond "the lions' dens" and the "mountains of the leopards" (Song iv. 6, 8), she shall sit down in the garden of her God, under the fair branches of the "Plant of renown," partaking of Him who is her life, in a way such as she has never done on earth, and feeling that thus she has a life which Adam had not, which angels have not,—a life that flows out of the deepest well of life, the bosom of Him who is in the bosom of the Father.

* The spiritual reference to the tree of life may be seen in such passages as the following, "She (wisdom) is a tree of life to them that lay hold of her" (Prov. iii. 18), and "the fruit of the righteous one is a tree of life" (Prov. xi. 30), that is, the fruit which the righteous one produces (words and deeds), is like a tree of life to all around; as in Jas. iii. 18, "The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace by them that make peace," that is, the fruit of righteousness, or righteous fruit, is sown by the peaceful walk and character of those who seek and make peace. The root of holiness is peace. Again we have, "When the desire cometh (when the thing desired is obtained), it is a tree of life" (Prov. xiii. 12); deferred hope sickens, fulfilled hope revives and invigorates. Again, "a wholesome tongue is a tree of life" (Prov. xv. 4), the healing of the tongue is like planting a tree of life. It diffuses life and health. Christ speaks of Himself as the "Bread of life," as if He were not merely fruit, but fruit specially prepared as the soul's food, ready to be partaken of, sent down from heaven, prepared by the Father's hands,—"the bread of God which came down from heaven, of which if a man eat he shall never hunger and never die."

Digitized by Google

Art. III.—HENGSTENBERG ON THE APOCALYPSE.*

We must confess that we did not look to the German school of criticism for any great assistance in enabling us to unravel the mysteries of the Apocalypse. We have, however, been most agreeably disappointed by Dr. Hengstenberg's work. Differing as we do from many of his views, we can honestly commend it as a work of no common interest, throwing great light upon the structure of the Book of Revelation, pregnant with enlarged and spiritual views, and pervaded by an unction which cannot fail to endear it to all "who search the Scriptures."

The first point which the author handles is, the time when the Apocalypse was written; and he decides in favour of the later, or *Domitianic* date. Our minds had already been made up in favour of this view, from a comparison of the arguments adduced in support of it by Elliott, in his "Horæ Apocalypticæ," with those on the other side to be found in Moses Stuart's "Commentary." But we have found several new and very convincing reasons stated by Hengstenberg, which appear to us conclusively to settle the question. We expected, however, that he would have handled, as he was peculiarly qualified to do, the argument which has been drawn from the difference of style between the Apocalypse and the Gospel, in favour of the earlier date of the former; and have been somewhat disappointed to find no allusion to it. One remark which he makes is interesting. In Asia, that is, Proconsular Asia, there were other Churches besides the seven which are mentioned, nor were these seven the most important Churches of the province. Yet they are called "*the* Seven Churches of Asia." History testifies that the apostle had a district in that particular part of Asia, which embraced quite a circle of churches, named by Tertullian, "John's nurslings." To these the seven Epistles are addressed. Now John could not have come to reside at Ephesus before the martyrdom of Paul, and in all probability did so on the occasion of the Jewish war. And as that war began in the year 66, the date of 68, which must be assumed if the apostle wrote under the Emperor Galba, leaves far too little time for the formation of such an intimacy as must have existed between him and the Churches of Asia.

* The Revelation of St. John, expounded for those who search the Scriptures. By E. W. Hengstenberg, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the original by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Digitized by Google

In turning over the commentary on the seven Epistles, we find some things worthy of remark. Our author holds the name of the Nicolaitans to be emblematical; meaning, "those who hold the doctrine of Balaam." Balaam signifies "Destroyer of the people," and Nicolaus, "Conqueror of the people." The latter was probably adopted instead of one more precisely answering to Balaam, because it was one in current use among the Greeks. So also he regards Antipas as an emblematic name, remarking that all the names found in the Apocalypse are symbolical. Antipas is formed exactly as Antichrist is, and means "One who is against all." He thinks it is not too bold a supposition that Timothy was the person designated Antipas. His martyrdom occurred in 97, when John was still at Patmos, and followed on an affair in which he truly showed the spirit of an Antipas, by setting himself, on a public solemnity, in strenuous opposition to heathenish disorder. Similar allusions to the names borne by the overseers of the Churches he supposes in ch. ii. 9, and iii. 1. The words, "but thou art rich," he supposes to convey a reference to Polycarp, which signifies "rich in fruits;" and when the angel at Sardis is rebuked in the words, "Thou hast a name that thou livest," he thinks, with Bengel, that it is very probable that the overseer of that Church had a name which signified "life," and of which occasion was taken to admonish him of the opposite nature of his condition.

On the promise to the Church at Pergamos, "To him will I give to eat of the hidden manna," he remarks, that manna was the wilderness-food of the Israelites, which ceased when they reached Canaan; and, according to the typology of Scripture, the wilderness corresponds to this life, and the possession of Canaan to the life which is to come. As both the condition, "he who overcomes," and the analogy of the other promises, are against a reference to what the Lord imparts in this life, he supposes that the character of manna as food for the wilderness is here left out of view, and only its character as *heavenly* food taken into account. We cannot but think that he fails in the full development of the promise. It is the *hidden* manna that is here offered; that is, the manna laid up in the golden pot, and preserved, with other sacred things, in the Holy of holies. And if the *un*hidden manna is the type of the fellowship with Christ which believers in this present life enjoy, the hidden manna, incorruptible from age to age, seems plainly to denote the fellowship with the *glorified* Redeemer, which the Church shall possess when she enters on her inheritance of glory.

Digitized by Google

But let us turn to the principal visions of the book. And first, we have the glorious theophany which was presented to the eye of the seer when he entered by "the door opened in heaven," and which we hold to have been a preface to the whole of the subsequent visions; and not, as our author represents it, only an introduction to the seven seals. A throne appears before the apostle, and one sitting on it. He was like a jasper and a sardine stone. The jasper, clear as crystal (see ch. xxi. 11): the sardine stone, of a flesh-colour, setting forth, according to Hengstenberg, the fire of the divine anger, along with the radiating light of the divine holiness. Around the throne sat four and twenty elders, crowned, and with white robes. These are the symbols of the Church, of which the number twelve is the signature, doubled here, as in ch. xxi., to take in the twelve patriarchs and the twelve apostles. Their crowns and raiment proclaim them to be "kings and priests." In the midst of the throne, and round about it, *i.e.*, beneath it, and yet visible on every side, were four living ones, the cherubim, not representing angelic beings, for the angels (see ch. vii. 11) form a circle around the elders, nor yet the symbol of the Church, which is represented by the elders, but the emblem of *creation*, bearing up the throne of the God of the whole earth. The number four is, according to our author, the signature of the earth. They are full of eyes, not to denote their wisdom or knowledge, but, as Irving long ago explained it, to signify that the whole living creation is *inspirited;* for the seven eyes of the Lamb are "the seven spirits of God that are sent forth upon the whole earth." Their likenesses represent the whole visible creation, for the man is first among the creatures, the eagle among birds, the ox among cattle, and the lion among beasts. Beautifully does our author explain their "resting not day nor night," by referring to Ps. xix. 3, "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night shows knowledge." As the heavens without ceasing declare the glory of God, the God of hosts, so also do the cherubim, or the creatures upon earth. The rainbow also round about the throne, the pledge of the covenant with Noah for the preservation of the earth, teaches us that the vision has respect unto the earth: grace returning after wrath is predicted;—a new heaven and a new earth after the deluge of fire. The thunders and lightnings and voices testify of approaching judgment; and the seven torches of fire, burning before the throne, symbolize the operations of God's Spirit upon the earth, especially as bringing chastisement and destruction. The sea of glass, like unto crystal, which

Digitized by Google

appeared before the throne, is identified by Hengstenberg with the sea of glass mingled with fire which is mentioned in ch. xv. 2. It seems to be identical in this place with the "firmament," which Ezekiel saw beneath the throne, and with the "pavement of sapphire as it were the body of heaven in clearness," which Moses saw under the feet of Jehovah.

Then, after a magnificent doxology to the God of creation, the vision of the seven-sealed book commences. We incline to hold with Irving that the book is the title of the inheritance of the earth, rather than with our author that it contains any portion of the revelation made to the apostle. The former view at once suggests a reason why none might open the seals but the Redeemer, the Lamb of God. But if the latter view be the correct one, then we hold, with Hengstenberg, that it is the architype, not of the whole Apocalypse from ch. vi., but only of the section of the seven seals.

In approaching the interpretation of this compound vision, we must observe that our author rejects any attempt to find a fulfilment of each seal in the history of the world; but, on the other hand, regards them as setting forth the general character of God's judgments, so that they may find manifold fulfilments in the course of God's providence. On the fifth trumpet he thus expresses himself:—

"How adverse the historizing mode of exposition is to the profitable understanding of the passage is clear from the words with which Bengel introduces his thoughts upon this section. 'The text before us may indeed be regarded as having little edification for us, because a woe is described in it which is already long since past; and if the prophecy plainly treated of such things, we should not expect to derive great profit from the consideration of it.'"

But if the mere fact that the accomplishment of a prophecy is long past renders that prophecy unprofitable, what shall we say of the visions of Daniel? Are those of them which received their fulfilment before Messiah came wholly useless to the Church? Again, in commenting upon the vision of the seals, he observes:—

"Bengel, in his 'Erbaulichen Reden,' gives utterance to a sentiment, which is of importance for judging in regard to the *historizing* mode of interpreting the Revelation adopted by him in common with many others: 'Thus far we have considered five chapters, and have not met with much of human history, although it was the substance and design of the book to show what was to come to pass. But now such things come. And from the quality of the persons here present, it is not possible to say much respecting them.' Bengel thus felt that the Revelation, in respect to its main subject, could not through his exposition be enjoyed by the vast majority of Christians, and remained dark in spite of all disclosures. This

Digitized by Google

should have led him to subject that mode of interpretation to a severe ordeal. For, it is scarcely at the outset to be imagined, that a book, which is so decidedly ecclesiastical in its contents, should have been intended for the narrow circle of the learned. And if we consider more closely, it would not thus be really fitted to serve the interests and necessities of that class. For what renders a book unintelligible to the unlettered Christian, also renders it unedifying to the learned. Even the resources and rare unction of a Bengel have not succeeded in preventing many parts of his exposition from being no farther edifying, than as an antiquated compend of universal history."

But we may reply as before, that if this canon is to be accepted as sound, we must on the same principle reject the interpretation of Daniel's prophecy of the "scripture of truth," which refers it to the wars of the successors of Alexander. That prediction, so interpreted, would surely be as unedifying to a common congregation, as any historical exposition of the seven seals. We must, however, defer our examination of this principle till we have the second volume of the work before us, and till we can thus compare the view which our author takes of the seven headed beast with his opinions already expressed regarding the four beasts of Daniel's visions. At present we do not see how, upon his principles, the two expositions can be consistent.

Instead of giving a synthetic exposition of the seven seals, we shall attempt an analytical investigation of them. The former method would give only the results at which we have arrived from a study of the vision, while the latter possesses the advantage of exhibiting the process by which we arrive at these results.

In surveying, then, the whole series of the seven seals, in order to find some point which may enable us to fix upon their chronological place, our attention is arrested by the words which occur at the close of the sixth seal, "For the great day of his wrath is come, and who is able to stand?" The great day of the Lord's wrath can only be the day of judgment, as Hengstenberg remarks; and we cannot consent to understand it as the day of the overthrow of Paganism. Hence this seal, which immediately precedes "the great day," must symbolise the convulsions which are to precede the day of judgment. This view is confirmed by observing the close agreement between the contents of this seal and the events which our Lord Himself predicts as the harbingers of his advent, in Matt. xxiv. It cannot indeed be denied that in the writings of the prophets the same signs are associated with other historical *crises* which were types of the last one; and that even in our Lord's discourse, they, as well as his

Digitized by Google

παρουσια, or coming, are apparently associated with the destruction of Jerusalem. But in a symbolical and chronological prophecy, which we hold the Apocalypse to be, we contend that the unchronological method of other prophecies can have no place, and that such a representation as that which the sixth seal reveals, can only be a symbol of the last great crisis which ushers in the coming of Christ. Moreover, the doxology with which the opening of this book is introduced plainly implies that when all the seals are opened, redemption work is finished, and we have, therefore, only to choose between the arrangement which includes the seven trumpets in the seventh seal, and the seven vials in the seventh trumpet, and the other, of which we have indicated our preference, which regards the seven seals as an independent series of predictions bringing us down to the "time of the end."

The seventh seal must therefore be the day of wrath, the approach of which is under the sixth seal, announced as imminent. The details of it are not given, but its opening is succeeded by "silence in heaven for half an hour." We had been accustomed to regard this silence as only indicative of the conclusion of one series of visions. Hengstenberg, however, gives a new and probably a more correct view of it. Referring to such passages as Hab. ii. 20, Zeph. i. 7, and Zech. ii. 13, he regards the silence as denoting the complete efficiency of the judgment,—the entire prostration of all that has hitherto raged against the Lord and against his Anointed.

Thus, then, the termination of the series of seals seems fixed to the end of the world, or the great day of judgment; and as in all probability the prophecy began to be fulfilled at, or about the time when the apostle saw the vision, there is a very long period to be covered by these connected predictions. Are we to distribute this period equally or nearly so over the seven seals? Besides the difficulty of providing any historical interpretation on this hypothesis, such a method receives no countenance from the manner in which the series of trumpet-visions is constructed; for if the fifth trumpet is to be referred to the Saracens, according to the almost universal agreement of commentators, the first four trumpets occupy a much shorter period than the last three. Among the seals there is, in like manner, a marked distinction between the four which open the series and the remaining ones. Probably, then, it will be found that the greatest space of time falls under one of the last seals, and if so, then, as the sixth is not yet fulfilled, a very long period must be occupied by the

Digitized by Google

fifth. These *à priori* considerations are much strengthened when we examine the contents of the seal. Hengstenberg remarks that as the whole of this series "announces the judgments of God on the ungodly world," the seal before us "forms an apparent exception which yet cannot be suffered without interrupting the symmetry of the whole." (P. 261.) But he does not appear to us to have entirely removed this difficulty when he says, "The substance, in short, of the 5th seal is such catastrophes as bring to view the final judgment on the world, and in connexion with that the glorification of the Church." (P. 262.) The seal seems to bring before us two bodies of martyrs: 1st, those who "were slain for the Word of God and for the testimony which they held;" and 2d, their "fellow-servants and their brethren that should be killed as they were." On turning to ch. xx. 4, we find the same two classes brought forward, and the second more particularly described as those "which had not worshipped the beast neither his image," &c. In short, the one body are the victims of Pagan, and the other the victims of Papal superstition. The place of the fifth seal then must be when Pagan persecution was closed and Papal persecution had not yet begun. Already by the preceding judgments the empire of Pagan Rome had been overthrown, and the anticipation was natural that the time had come when God would avenge the blood of the martyrs. But they are told that they must rest yet a little season till the slaughter of their brethren should be fulfilled. The purpose therefore of the seal is to carry us over the whole period of the Papacy, until, in the next seal, the final judgments commence upon the world. Nor can it be objected that this long period is here called a little season. The statement must be judged of according to prophetic chronology, in which that interval stands marked as three years and a half.

In regard to the symbols employed, Hengstenberg well remarks:—

"The souls of the martyrs in ver. 9 are not the souls in the intermediate state, as expositors commonly suppose; the souls are meant, of which it is said in the Old Testament, that they are in the blood—the animal souls (see, for example, Gen. ix. 5); they are murdered souls; but the blood itself might as well have stood, and in ver. 10 indeed is actually put instead of the souls here. This is plain from comparing the original passage, Gen. iv. 10, where the blood of Abel cries to God from the ground."

The cry for vengeance, then, is symbolic of a persecution past and gone. No new souls appear to be added to the

Digitized by Google

company, and the only point that still requires examination is their investiture with white raiment. Our author supposes that this act implies that "they must be satisfied meanwhile with the heavenly glory, till the time should come when the kingdom of glory would be set up on earth." (P. 270.) This plainly falls short of the meaning of the passage, which represents something as given which they did not possess before. Much better is Vitringa's explanation, "That those martyrs shall be openly justified in the Church," or rather before the world, for, as Elliott remarks, the scene was the open altar court. And did not such a justification take place when Constantine, having embraced Christianity, enacted that the places of worship and public lands which had been confiscated should be restored to the Church, without dispute, without delay, and without expense; and proclaimed to the world that he had granted a free and absolute power to the Christians, and to all others, of following the religion which each individual thought proper to prefer, to which he had addicted his mind, and which he might deem the best adapted to his own use? Still more conspicuous was their justification, when the very creed, for the adherence to which these martyrs suffered, became the acknowledged creed of the Empire, and the whole influence of authority was cast on the side of Christianity. And if any thing more was required to complete that justification, we find it in the fact, that, according to Eusebius, Constantinople, the new metropolis of the empire, was dedicated to the *God of martyrs*.

Thus, then, we have obtained another fixed point for the chronology of this vision, having ascertained that the first four seals belong to the Pagan Empire. The fourth seal presents us with an additional mark for determining the date of its fulfilment. Power is given to death, the rider on the pale horse, and hell which followed him, over the *fourth* part of the earth. This phrase is interpreted by Hengstenberg as implying that the fourth part of the human race only is destroyed, and that, therefore, fearful judgments were yet to come; and in like manner he regards the limitation of the trumpets to the third part of the earth, as denoting that their judgments are not final. (P. 259, 343.) But why, if this be all, are the *fourth* and the *third* parts especially mentioned, more than the half? Or why is not the same fractional part employed in both series of visions. More likely surely is it, that there is here a reference to some well known division of the Roman earth. In a former article on the Trumpets we gave our reasons for believing that the "third part of the

Digitized by Google

earth" is the Eastern Empire, and we shall now show that the phrase before us finds in history a corresponding explanation. Mr. Elliott, in the first volume of his celebrated work (p. 331), gives us a list of the divisions of the Roman Empire which were made at various periods. Among these we only find one *quadri*partition, that made by Diocletian, which lasted for only a short period. After his abdication, the four emperors who succeeded shared among them the Roman earth. For a short time after this there were six emperors or pretended emperors, but no new division of the provinces took place; and, by the death of some of them, there were, by and by, again only four heads of the empire. These were, Constantine in Britain and the western provinces; Maxentius in Italy and Africa; Licinius in Illyricum; and Maximian in Syria. Among the Roman emperors it is difficult to select any individual whose cruelty and rapacity exceeded that of Maxentius. Africa refused at first to acknowledge his authority. Troops were sent over from Italy. The rebellion was crushed, but the woes of Africa were not ended. All of birth and property were accused of having shared in the rebellion. Many were put to death; the remainder were punished by the confiscation of their estates. Cirtha and Carthage were sacked, pillaged, and ruined, and the whole extent of that fertile province was wasted with fire and sword. "So signal a victory," says Gibbon, "was celebrated by a magnificent triumph, and Maxentius exposed to the eyes of the people the spoils of a Roman province." Nor were Rome and Italy better treated. "The lives of the senators were exposed to his jealous suspicions, and the dishonour of their wives and daughters heightened the gratification of his sensual passions." * He encouraged his soldiers to the commission of the same crimes. In six years he spoiled the immense riches which during ten centuries had been accumulated at Rome. He filled Italy with armed troops, and suffered them with impunity to plunder and even to massacre the defenceless people. Rome was reduced to such a state, that its inhabitants were deprived of the very necessaries of life; and there prevailed in the capital a *famine* such as had never before been experienced.

Such was the unspeakable wretchedness of this fourth part of the Roman earth, Italy and Africa, under the tyranny of Maxentius. But we have told only a part of the woes of Italy. Thrice was the sword lifted to expel the usurper, and thrice did her plains groan under the presence of an invading

* Gibbon.

Digitized by Google

host. First, Severus hastened to Rome, but was obliged to retreat to Ravenna, where he was besieged, capitulated, and was put to death. Then Galerius, at the head of a powerful army, entered Italy, resolved, as he said, to extirpate the Senate, and destroy the people. With difficulty he penetrated as far as Narni, and when he found it necessary to retreat, Gibbon tells us that his soldiers "murdered, ravished, and plundered, and drove away the flocks and herds of the Italians. They burned the villages through which they passed, and endeavoured to destroy the country which they had not been able to subdue." Lastly, when the tyranny of Maxentius had become intolerable, and ambassadors had been sent to Constantine, to entreat him to deliver Italy, that prince crossed the Alps. Then followed in swift succession the sieges of Susa, Turin, Verona, Aquileia, and Modena, closed by a battle under the walls of Rome, in which Constantine was victorious.

War, famine, death, and wild beasts are the four plagues which appear under the fourth seal. The war and famine we have seen fulfilled, and we cannot doubt that the two remaining plagues must have followed in their train. Unquestionably Constantine must have been greatly influenced by the miserable and dilapidated condition of Italy in removing the seat of Government from Rome to Byzantium. A document still remains to us, from which we learn that within sixty years after the death of Constantine there were 330,000 English acres of desert and uncultivated land in the province of Campania, once the garden of Italy. If one-eighth of the whole of this fertile district was thus desolate before the northern barbarians began their incursions, we cease to wonder that the Emperor should have removed his court from this impoverished region.

Let it be observed, then, that all the calamities we have recounted happened during the *only* period in which the empire was divided into *four* parts, and that the fourth seal, if our interpretation be correct, was the last or *death*-plague of the Pagan empire; for almost immediately after it, Constantine became sole Emperor, and Christianity was acknowledged as the religion of the State. The perfect correspondence of our interpretations of the fourth and of the fifth seals, —interpretations, it will be remarked, wholly independent of each other,—forms a new argument in favour of the correctness of both.

Our space will not permit us to examine minutely the

Digitized by Google

three seals which commence the series. The red and black horses, with their accompaniments, are regarded by Hengstenberg as symbolical of war and scarcity, while he conceives that the rider on the white horse is Christ himself. Without positively rejecting this interpretation, we must say that the reasons given for it do not appear conclusive. Especially do we think him in error, when, comparing this vision with that of the many-crowned rider on the white horse, who appears in chap. xix. 11, he says of this seal, "The crown is not the victor's crown, but the badge of royal dignity." For in this place the crown is στεφανος, whereas, in chap. xix. 11, the word used is διαδημα. Now, στεφανος is properly the laurel crown of the Roman emperors, while διαδημα is the royal crown, and is the word employed to designate the crowns on the heads and on the horns of the beast. We incline, therefore, to believe, that, by use of the former symbol, the first rider is designated, either as a typical figuration of the Imperial authority, or at least as a warrior crowned for victory.

From the seals we now turn to the vision of the sealing of 144,000 from the twelve tribes of Israel. We agree with our author in holding that the act of sealing represents God's watchful care over his own, while pouring forth his retribution on the world;—and that those sealed are not the literal Israel, but the elect of God, marked by the number twelve, the signature of the Church, while their multitude is denoted by that number being multiplied into itself and then by 1000 (comp. xxi. 16, 17). But when he tells us that "the innumerable multitude" of the vision which immediately succeeds (ver. 9), are the same as the 144,000 who have just been brought before us, we can agree with him no longer. For the two visions appear to be distinctly separated the one from the other by the words, "*After these things* I saw," at the commencement of the second; and the condition and circumstances of those represented, is not at all the same in the one as in the other. The sealed ones are protected from judgments *yet to come*, while the white-robed multitude have left all fear and sorrow behind them. The sealed belong to the tribes of Israel; but the multitude are "of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues." They have come, also, out of *the great tribulation*, a period which appears to coincide with the seventh seal. Their white robes and the palms in their hands are indicative, as Hengstenberg remarks, of the feast of tabernacles; but that feast in the Apocalypse is the

Digitized by Google

symbol of millennial glory; and the conclusion therefore to which we come is, that as in the first of the two visions we have the safety of the elect in the midst of judgments, so in the second the glory of the righteous on the millennial earth is represented. The foundation of our author's error on this point appears to lie in his supposition "that nothing can be here unfolded which lies absolutely beyond the seventh seal," a supposition for which we can discover no foundation. The vision of chap. vii. is an independent vision, connected indeed with the seals, but by no means confined within their limits, for it evidently stretches forward into that scene of glory of which the full development is reserved for the closing chapters of the book. And unless this view of it be taken, we think that an insurmountable difficulty will have to be encountered in the exposition of the subsequent visions. For in chap. xiv. the same one hundred and forty-four thousand appear, and are there called the *first fruits;* then the *harvest* follows; and after that, we have the "voice of a great multitude" rejoicing that the marriage of the Lamb is come (xix. 6, 7). Whence we gather that the sealed ones are the "Church of the first-born," the "Bride of Christ," who are sheltered in the chambers of the Almighty from the last plagues that shall come upon the earth; while the "multitudes" are the converted nations, the virgin-companions who follow the Bride, when she enters into the King's palaces.

We do not intend to enter upon any examination of the trumpet visions, as we presented our views on that portion of the Apocalypse pretty fully on a former occasion (vol. i., p. 287), and we have not seen any reason for changing them. We shall content ourselves with pointing out the relation which the seals and trumpets bear to one another. The first four seals, as we have seen, belong to the Roman Empire in its undivided state, bringing the history down to the removal of the seat of Government to Constantinople; then follows a space, left to be afterwards filled up with the history of the Papacy; and after that the judgments of the sixth seal. The trumpets belong to the Eastern Empire, and commence, of course, at a period somewhat later than the opening of the fifth seal. The first four trumpets carry the history to the extinction of the Roman Empire in the east, and the fifth and sixth depict the fall of the Byzantine Empire by the Saracens and Turks. Under the sixth trumpet the history of the two witnesses is also included, and the earthquake which accompanies their ascension into heaven (chap. xi. 13),

Digitized by Google

appears to be synchronous with the earthquake of the sixth seal. The seventh seal and the seventh trumpet thus fall into the same place, being the last great judgment by which the Redeemer takes possession of his kingdom.

Among the trumpets, there occurs, however, a vision which belongs more properly to the series of seals. Between the sixth and seventh an interlude is placed, just as between the sixth and seventh seals there is inserted the vision of the one hundred and forty-four thousand, and of the palm-bearing multitude. A strong angel descends from heaven, with a little book in his hand, which the prophet is commanded to eat. All are agreed that the angel is Christ, and Hengstenberg tells us that His action, the planting, namely, of His foot upon the sea and upon the earth, indicates His approaching possession of both. Upon this act the oath is a commentary. He swears that "no time more shall be," that is, according to our author, that there shall be no farther delay, but that in the days of the seventh trumpet, the mystery of God shall be finished. We may also take his explanation of this mystery. "It affects," he says, "the Lord's dominion over the world, the judgment of the world, and the full establishment of the servants of God in their inheritance." This is the very consummation which we were prepared to expect when the seven-sealed book should be fully opened, and there are other accessories of the vision which carry us back to that book. Thus the rainbow which was around the throne, appears on the head of the angel:—He who was before represented as the lion of the tribe of Judah, now "cries with a loud voice as when a *lion roareth:*" His oath is by the ever-living *Creator*, with an evident allusion to the doxology at the close of the fourth chapter. The most natural conclusion surely is, that the little book *opened* (not *open*), is so much of the seven-sealed book as belonged to the last of the seals; called "*little*," therefore, to distinguish it from the undiminished volume. It had been opened before, but its contents were not divulged. The prophet is now made acquainted with them, and an accompanying intimation is given, that they relate to the Redeemer's assumption of his kingdom, and that, in fact, they are synchronous with the seventh trumpet. By connecting the visions in this way a wonderful harmony is evolved. The seals and the trumpets are seen to run parallel with one another;—a place is reserved under the fifth seal, into which the history of the Papal beast exactly fits;—and the last great catastrophe, contained in the little book, is afterwards evolved with a dignity suitable to its

Digitized by Google

importance, in the vials and other parallel visions, ending in the destruction of the enemies of the Redeemer, and the marriage supper of the Lamb.

Here, then, we must conclude our survey, for although the vision of the *great red dragon* is commented on in this volume, it is too closely connected with the remaining portion of the Apocalypse to be discussed by us till we have before us the second volume of Hengstenberg's work.

ART. IV.—DOES THE SOUL SLEEP?

DOES the *soul* sleep in the interval between death and resurrection? Is it conscious or unconscious? These are questions which can be answered only by a reference to the Word of God; for nature will tell us nothing, and tradition, unsupported by inspiration, is quite worthless. Searching, then, in those oracles of truth, which teach us alike what we now are, and what our future destinies will be, we find that on this subject, as on all others, the revelation which God gave to his people had a *progressive* character. The darkness of the unenlightened mind was first dawned upon by the glimmering twilight, not at once illuminated by the full blaze of perfect day. The great and glorious doctrine of the resurrection was not known in all its fulness to the earlier Old Testament saints.*

In perfect accordance with this prevailing obscurity, we find death spoken of in some passages as if it were the consummation of all things as regarded the deceased individual. "I am counted with them that go down into the pit," says the Psalmist: "I am as a man that hath no strength: free among the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, *whom thou rememberest no more:* and *they are cut off from thy hand.* Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in *destruction?* Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" (Ps. lxxxviii.) Here is a man

* Yet we have no doubt that Job xix. 25 refers to the resurrection, whatever some critics may say. Still less doubt have we that Job xiv. 11—15 refers to it. (See "Journal of Prophecy" vol. i., p. 74.) All the patriarchs seem to have realized *resurrection* very strongly, though, of course, not with the same clearness as we are now enabled to do.—*Editor.*

Digitized by Google

oppressed in spirit, feeling that his days on earth are growing few, and groping fearfully and tremblingly in the dark void before him. It would seem as if he had some kind of half hope that all was not so sad as he imagined, that by possibility there might be even from the grave a rising to praise God; that his loving-kindness and his wonders might be known even there: but the prevailing images presented to his thoughts are melancholy in the extreme—destruction and forgetfulness. And so he lifts up his voice in this plaintive wailing; and while faith still urges him to "prevent his God by prayer in the morning," he cries out in his misery, "Lord, why castest thou off my soul? why hidest thou thy face from me?"

In like manner Hezekiah,—"I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord, in the land of the living: I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world. Mine age is departed, and is removed from me as a shepherd's tent: I have cut off like a weaver my life: he will cut me off with pining sickness: from day even to night wilt thou make an end of me. . . The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." (Isa. xxxviii. 11, 12, 18.) No wonder that with a prospect before him so utterly gloomy, the sick monarch should have clung to life with a grasp so tenacious, and have received the warning of his departure in a spirit of such deep sadness.

There are other similar passages in the Psalms, as cxv. 17, cxlvi. 4, and in Ecclesiastes there are strong statements, *apparently* supporting the idea of the *unconsciousness* of the spirits of the departed.* "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die: but *the dead know not any thing*, neither *have they any more a reward;* for the memory of them is forgotten." (Eccl. ix. 4, 5.) Words could not more clearly express a condition of utter helplessness and hopelessness, but the succeeding verse shows that they have reference merely to the relations subsisting between the dead and the living inhabitants of earth. "Also their

* It should be observed that in all such passages, it is not the *soul* that is referred to, but the *complete man*, the *Ego*, the *I*. The dissolution of soul and body throws the *man* into an imperfect state, so that he can no longer think, feel, and act *in the same full way* as he did before; but the soul is not thereby rendered unconscious or inactive. Its consciousness and activity will no doubt be of a different kind, and find vent in a different way, but that is all. There is no passage in Scripture which affirms that the *soul* sleeps. The *man* is said to sleep, but not the soul.—*Editor.*

Digitized by Google

love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished: neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun." They might be perfectly conscious, and more than this, busied in a perpetual activity, and yet the former be true, that, so far as earthly things and earthly doings are concerned, they are as if they were not. The passage, therefore, will not help to determine the question in either way.

But even from out of the obscurity which for the most part shrouds the Old Testament declarations on this subject, we may, I conceive, gather some indications at least of a different state of things. In that portion of the prophecies of Isaiah, where he is singing the anticipated dirge of the fallen king of Babylon, we find these words:—"Hell (Hades) from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. *All they shall speak and say unto thee,* Art thou also become weak as we? art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." (Isa. xiv. 9—11.) And so also Ezekiel in his lamentation over Pharaoh, king of Egypt:—"The strong among the mighty *shall speak to him out of the midst of hell* with them that help him: they are gone down, they lie uncircumcised, slain by the sword." Then after enumerating these mighty inhabitants of the region of spirits,—"Asshur and all her company, Elam and all her multitude, Meshech, Tubal, and all her multitude; Edom, her kings, and her princes, the princes of the north, and the Zidonians," the prophet continues, "Pharaoh *shall see them,* and *shall be comforted* over all his multitude, even Pharaoh and all his army slain by the sword, saith the Lord God." (Ezek. xxxii. 21, &c.)

Now, without insisting too strongly on the literality of a description so highly poetical in its imagery, it is, I think, very evident that the idea of *unconsciousness* will not bear the test of these passages. It is not necessary for our argument to insist upon the absolute accomplishment of the scene so vividly depicted by the prophet (though why we should hesitate to believe all that is written is a question not easily answered), all that I would urge is simply this:—If departed spirits be unconscious, could the inspired men of old have chosen such illustrations of the truths which they desired to inculcate? Would they, when thus solemnly exposing the nothingness of human glory, the abasement of the pride of the great tyrants of the earth, have employed language

Digitized by Google

descriptive of a state of things which never could occur?—have represented these mighty shades as seeing, and speaking, and feeling, when in reality they could see nothing, and hear nothing, and know nothing? The supposition is utterly inconsistent with every right idea of a Divine inspiration. The Holy Ghost cannot lead into anything but TRUTH.

The interview of Saul with the woman who had a familiar spirit will help also to throw some light on the subject, by illustrating the nature of the prevalent belief. It will be remembered that that unhappy monarch, on the eve of his last battle, deserted of God, who vouchsafed no answer to his inquiries, either by dreams, or by Urim, or by prophets, and with the death-shade already on his soul, paid a night visit to Endor, and commanded the sorceress to bring up Samuel. "And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do." (1 Sam. xxviii. 15.) Such a narrative as this is quite unintelligible on the hypothesis that the disembodied spirits are unconscious, and that their condition was known or believed to be such. Low as Saul had fallen in his downward career, and daring as was this closing act of desperate impiety, we must accuse him of unmitigated childish absurdity, as well as sin, if we can suppose that he took this step, at the same time believing that the spirit of the departed prophet was in a state of unconscious apathy. I do not say that the event in question proves the contrary, though it does serve to strengthen other arguments that way, but most certainly it shows in which direction the popular creed pointed, and is, therefore, so far a help towards the correct understanding of the passages already quoted from the Psalms and other parts of the Old Testament. For it is not probable that the writers of these held views at variance with those of their contemporaries; and therefore the idea that, in their lamentations at the prospect of death, they were chiefly looking to the separation from the abodes and doings of men on the scene of this present life, acquires much additional force.

But there is more than this, for Samuel, in his answer to Saul, after repeating what he had told him during his life-time, viz., that he was rejected of God for his obstinate rebellions, and that his kingdom was given to another, adds this

Digitized by Google

melancholy and true prediction,—"Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines: and to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me: the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines." (V. 19.) Now, there are three ways in which this remarkable passage may be explained. Samuel may, at the moment when he uttered it, have received the revelation of what he declared; or he may have received the knowledge of the exact time of Saul's death during his own life; or he may have known it in his abode in Hades. The first two are compatible with the idea of unconsciousness; the latter is not. In the absence of positive assertions it is impossible to decide which is the most correct interpretation; but the balance of argument inclines to the last, as will be apparent afterwards.

We pass now from the Old Testament to the clearer records of the New; and the first passage which will engage our attention is our Lord's parable of Dives and Lazarus. It is at once apparent how utterly the idea of unconsciousness is opposed to the scene there pictured for our instruction. The rich man is represented in torments, seeing Lazarus afar off in Abraham's bosom, and imploring the great patriarch to send the once-despised beggar to dip the tip of his finger in water to cool his tongue. The request, he is told, cannot be granted; and then the unhappy sufferer, yearning over those whom he had left behind in all the carelessness of an ungodly life like his own, again prefers a petition that Lazarus may be sent to warn them, lest they too should come to the same place of torment. Here we have the senses in full operation,—seeing, hearing, speaking, feeling. There is nothing like unconsciousness; there is everything the very reverse. It may be argued that the state spoken of is not the intermediate condition of disembodied spirits, but the future final or resurrection condition. But this cannot be. The events are described as taking place immediately after the death of the persons; and, moreover, Dives has five brethren still alive on the earth. Had the general resurrection taken place (in which only that unhappy man could have a share), his brethren would have risen too, and been beyond the reach of preaching.

Or it may be said, Lazarus is not represented as taking any part in the discussion, he is merely spoken of as lying in Abraham's bosom,—a figure strongly indicative of peaceful repose. The lost one may have been conscious of his misery; the saved unconscious of his happiness. But

Digitized by Google

Abraham speaks of him as being *comforted.* This implies sensation. It would be an abuse of language to use such a term of a person insensible.

And this remark leads me to speak of our Lord's promise to the penitent thief: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Our Lord, when he died, went into "Hades;" Paradise must therefore be in the same locality, and there the thief was to be with Him. Can it be for a moment supposed, that he would not be *conscious* of the presence of his Lord? And yet, if departed spirits are unconscious, he must have been so too; and though his dying ears caught the sweet words of the promise, he would never know that it had been fulfilled, until he awoke on the morning of the resurrection! He does not know it yet, though 1800 years have passed since it was spoken and accomplished!

St. Paul speaks strongly of the blessedness of the believer's condition after death. "I have a desire," he says, "to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better." (Phil. i. 23.) * The great apostle, while on earth, lived in close spiritual communion with the Lord whom he loved,—he realized his oneness with Him,—he felt that Christ was dwelling in him,—he gloried in doing his master's work, in serving his master's cause. "For me to live," he could say, "is Christ," and yet in the same breath he declares, "to die is gain." Could this be, if, after death, there were to be an interval of indefinitely prolonged unconsciousness? Would he desire to give up, even for a day, that blessed intercourse which he had so long and so fully enjoyed? It is impossible to imagine it. There would be sorrow in the believer's heart at the thought of death, not joy, if the gloomy portals of the grave opened upon a dreary region of forgetfulnes, where the presence of the Lord would be unfelt, unknown.

It is argued, however, that as in profound sleep there is sometimes, on waking, no remembrance of the interval which has been slept through, so it may be with the believer when he falls asleep in Jesus. He may awake out of that deep repose at the resurrection, feeling as if his emancipated soul had just at that moment laid down the old corrupt tenement of clay, and put on at once the glorified body; and that, therefore, St. Paul's language is not too strong, though the

* "The phrase 'to be with Christ' (Comp. 2 Cor. v. 8; Heb. xii. 23; Acts vii. 59), implies that, immediately upon death, a new and more complete life-fellowship with Christ begins in the soul of man,—a being at home with the Lord, as it is called in the first of the passages above adduced."—*Wiesinger on Philippians.*

Digitized by Google

dead be unconscious. But this explanation will not apply to another assertion, equally distinct, of the same apostle. In writing to the Corinthians, he says,—"Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, *whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord:* (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and *willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.*" (2 Cor. v. 6, 7, 8.) Here it is quite evident that the separate state is the one spoken of, because it is described by the term, "absent from the body," and it is declared as being preferable by reason of the presence of the Lord which will be then enjoyed. And to enjoy this there must be consciousness.

In the 6th chapter of the Revelation we find that when the Lamb opened the fifth seal of the book, the apostle "Saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." (v. 9—11.) There are difficulties connected with the full interpretation of this passage, as, for instance, what special martyrs these are,—whether those who have sealed their witness with their lives at any time, or those who are to be slain during the reign of the great final Antichrist; and why they are represented as occupying that particular locality, "under the altar," while other departed saints are placed elsewhere. But these do not concern us at present. The passage is quoted simply for the evidence it affords of the *consciousness* of the separate spirits of the just; and this appears to me to be very strong. For it is clear that the *time* at which the event recorded takes place, is antecedent to the first resurrection. The souls are represented as waiting and wondering at the long delay of the vengeance of God. They know that at some period or another the treasured wrath of the Holy and True will be poured out on the earth, and the ungodly be punished for their evil deeds, their cruel persecutions, their death-dealings to the brethren of Jesus. And they marvel that the long-suffering Judge can remain so patient still. But they are told still to wait; they are informed that they must rest yet for a little season,—that their numbers are not yet com-

Digitized by Google

pleted; for still on the earth are certain of their brethren, whom a like bloody end of mortal life is awaiting. They are reminded, in short, of that great truth, which can never be too often repeated, that God's dealings with the world have ever a strict reference to his Church; that He bears with the wicked—that He withholds his hand from crushing them and their master, only until his designs respecting his own peculiar people are accomplished. The treasured vengeance, though delayed, is sure. The despised saints of the Most High are, in reality, the preservers of the world. When they are all gathered in, when the wheat is garnered into the barn, then, but not till then, will the fiery bolt fall, and the tares be burnt in everlasting destruction.

But if the dead are unconscious,—if the spirit when separated from its mortal clay-house knows nothing, and feels nothing, what can be the meaning of this passage? How can the souls be spoken of as asking why the Lord remains thus quiet? They would not be aware of that fact. His delay would produce no effect upon them, because they would have no cognisance of it. Like all other things, it would be as though it were not. And how could they be told to remain still resting, until their other brethren were slain? To what sense would these words be addressed? If in a state of unconsciousness their own rest would be unfelt, the existence of their brethren, and of the earth with its indwellers altogether forgotten. To speak to them, to explain to them, would be alike needless and useless.

It may be said, however, that the vision is for our instruction merely, to teach us what are the Lord's designs; and that it does not necessarily imply any actual transaction. To me this seems a very dangerous method of interpretation. I cannot but regard it as a rash and unwarrantable tampering with the Word of God. We are plainly told that the apostle saw these things and heard these words: where is our right to call the truth or the reality of them in question? But even if it were so, would that supposition bear out the argument? I think not. For surely it would be quite inconsistent with the truthfulness of Scripture to represent, even in vision or in parable, what could by no means be a correct picture. The lesson to be taught might have been easily conveyed in other ways. An angel, as in other visions, might have asked the question, and an angel have replied. God's purposes could have been thus revealed quite as clearly, quite as unmistakeably, and consistency and accuracy maintained inviolate. (Vide Daniel viii. 16.)

Digitized by Google

It seems to me, also, that we may deduce another testimony in favour of the view here maintained, from the immediately preceding chapter of the same book of Revelation. Then, when the Lamb, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, had taken the sealed book out of the right hand of Him that sat on the throne, we are told that, "The four living creatures and four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having, every-one of them, harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth." (v. 8—13.) There are, of course, differences of opinion as to who are represented by the four-and-twenty elders, and symbolized by the living creatures,—the cherubim. The explanation that commends itself most to my judgment is that, together, they are to be regarded as representatives of the whole Church of the faithful, under both economies; for it is plain that they stand in the place of saved men; for they speak of themselves as redeemed by the blood of Jesus, and as kings and priests who are to reign on the earth, which we know is the high and peculiar honour of Christ's chosen people. If this be so, can it be supposed that the representatives should be in a condition not only different, but altogether opposed to that of the persons represented?—that the one should exhibit mental perceptions and mental activity, while the other possessed neither?—that the one should employ themselves in the lofty exercise of praise, while the other lay dormant in the cold negation of unconsciousness?

But death is constantly spoken of in Scripture under the term,—sleep. Does not this imply want of consciousness? Certainly not, if we are to determine the point by scriptural examples rather than by mere physiological considerations. It may be quite true that in the state of perfect, profound sleep there is no remembrance of the interval between its commencement and its end; but it is no less true that in ordinary sleep the mind is oftentimes peculiarly active, busied with many thoughts, occupied in many scenes. Where is the proof that the word sleep, when applied in Scripture to the dead, has reference to the first rather than to the last of these modifications? May it not be rather affirmed that the contrary is most probably the truth? Let us attend for a moment to what is written. In the Book of Job we find

Digitized by Google

Elihu discoursing thus, "For God speaketh once, yea twice, yet man perceiveth it not. *In a dream*, in a vision of the night, *when deep sleep falleth* upon men, in slumberings upon the bed; *then he openeth the ears of men*, and sealeth their instruction." (Job xxxiii. 14—16.) It would thus seem that night and sleep are chosen times for God to manifest Himself and declare his purposes to his people. And so we shall find that it really was. It was in a *vision* that God communicated to Abraham the promise that he should have a son. (Gen. xv. 1, 4.) It was when "deep sleep" had fallen upon him, that the covenant was made and ratified. (v. 12 to end.) It was during the night that the Lord appeared to Isaac, to strengthen his faith, after he had been exposed to the enmity of the herdsmen of Gerar. (Gen. xxvi. 24.) It was during sleep that Jacob saw his glorious vision, and learned how closely earth is connected with heaven. (Gen. xxviii. 11, &c.) The future pre-eminence of Joseph was revealed to him in dreams. (Gen. xxxvii.) The approaching years of plenty and of famine were made known to Pharaoh in the same way. (Gen. xl. 1.) It was in a dream that the Lord appeared to Solomon, and bade him ask what he would, and gave him more than he asked. (1 Kings iii. 5—14.) Daniel received his wonderful revelations through the medium of dreams, "and visions of his head upon his bed." (Dan. vii. 1.) It was by a dream that Joseph, the husband of Mary, was instructed in the character of the marvellous child which was to be born of the Virgin. (Matt. i. 20.) And yet again will it be the same when that prophecy of Joel's receives its perfect fulfilment, for "it shall come to pass afterward," saith God, "that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, your old men shall *dream dreams*, your young men shall *see* visions." (Joel ii. 28.)

It is clear, therefore, that while the body rests in sleep, the soul *may* hold communion with its Maker; it is certain that in these, and in many others which might be quoted, it did enjoy more full, more close communion than when the senses were awake, and the outward things of earth visible and audible. May it not be the same during the sleep of death? May not the spirit then have purer, higher intercourse with its Saviour, and thus to the full bear out the truth of Paul's words,—to depart and to be with Christ is far better? Analogy, I think, evidently supports this view, which reconciles what otherwise might appear incongruous statements.

Surely, then, when we picture to ourselves the condition of

Digitized by Google

those who have fallen asleep in Jesus, we are warranted by the Word of God in regarding it as one of perfect rest, of conscious rest,—of rest illuminated by the beatific vision,—of rest which is undisturbed by care, unruffled by sorrow or by suffering, deep and calm like the placid ocean, but like it, lighted up and beautified by reflections of the heavenly glory.

Notes on Scripture.

THE PLEASANT LAND.

DEUT. XI. 12.

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for; the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year."

THESE words form part of an appeal which the God of Israel made to his people, wherein He calls for their allegiance and affection, on the ground of his great acts and gracious intentions. The Lord recounts what he had done in bringing them out of Egypt, in destroying Pharaoh and his host, and in judging the rebels who had risen up among them. "Your eyes (says Moses) have seen all the great things which the Lord did." Obedience is required of them as the condition of their peaceable and protracted possession of the promised inheritance. That heritage—"the land which God had espied for them"—is next described with much minuteness and beauty. It is contrasted with Egypt, and shown to be a more beautiful and fertile land than even that far-famed country; and God engages that if they will love and serve Him, the land shall continue to be "a delightsome land." But the testimony most worthy of notice is, that Canaan is a land especially cared for by God, and that his eyes are continually upon it. We are bound to believe this testimony, and should not let any thoughts or views unbeseeming God's greatness, and independence of places and localities, interfere with a full and simple reception of this declaration. The fact that the Most High, who filleth all space with his presence, cares more especially for this *one* little spot on our small world, is in agreement with many other parts of God's Word; and it is his clearly revealed purpose that in the winding up of all human affairs, He will make this fact abundantly manifest.

How frequently did God speak with Abraham about this land, Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 4—18; xv. 18—21, &c., &c.,—and He did the same with Isaac and Jacob, and afterward to Moses. Those who think that belief in the future glories of Canaan is puerile and wrong, have little sympathy with the Psalmist (cv. 6—11), where the covenant with Abraham, the oath to Isaac, and its confirmation to Jacob, and "to Israel for an everlasting covenant" are all shown to centre in this, "Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan; the lot of your inheritance."

Digitized by Google

This "covenant and word" is said "to be commanded to a *thousand generations*," which has never yet been fulfilled.

Who that considers the past history, the present condition, and the future destiny of Canaan, but must see reason for all that God has said about it? In that land he has displayed Himself, exhibited his character, and revealed his grace. It hath been the home of his tabernacle and temple, with all its splendid rites and mystic glories. Its hills have resounded with the lyre of his prophets, and from its lovely valleys the prayers of his faithful ones have gone up from age to age. Thus He made it a beacon-light in a dark world, sustaining there a witness (though, alas! sometimes feeble), for his own unity and holiness, in opposition to the many and filthy deities of the heathen. In the fulness of time it became the chosen theatre for redemption work; over its surface and on its waters walked the feet of "Immanuel, God with us." The Son of God, the Son of man, breathed its balmy air, plucked its clustering fruits, and gazed with pleasure on its lovely landscapes. Out of one of its trees a cross was made, and he hung upon it. From one of its mines iron was brought and fashioned into nails to pierce his blessed hands and feet. In one of its caves his breathless body was laid for a while, and after he left those gloomy shades He still lingered forty days amidst the valleys, nooks, and hills, "of the land which God careth for." Well may we wonder at all this; but we shall not stagger at the same, when we remember that He first took the dust of our earth into personal and indissoluble union with his Divine nature. In our nature He ascended to heaven; still casting loving looks on the land of his birth and pilgrimage, and pronouncing, as He gave his last commission, the name of Jerusalem in tones of richest tenderness,—ascended to glory; to make "the land that He cared for" *the fountain of truth*,—living waters flowed from it, and made glad and beautiful many a barren Gentile wilderness. Thus his dying prayer was answered, and his parting command fulfilled. Jerusalem became vocal with his name, and many Jerusalem sinners were forgiven. But ere He died his tears had been mingled with the dust of Judah; and wherefore felt He such bitter sorrow? He saw that the glory would depart,—that the temple must fall,—the people be scattered,—and Jerusalem be trodden down. All was accomplished. He put not forth his Almighty hand to hinder it, for He intended to make this long-favoured, guilty land, a *monument of Divine wrath*, on which justice should write in broad legible characters God's hatred of sin, especially the sin of unbelief. There it stands like a burnt mountain, still smoking with the heat of God's anger. It reads the whole world a grand moral lesson, and bids the possessors of privileges "not be high-minded, but fear."

But its destinies are more glorious than its past history is wonderful, or its present condition saddening. God will "heal the land," "He will be merciful unto his land and to his people." (Deut. xxxii. 43.) He whose purpose is stedfast as the ordinances of heaven, says, "Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken, neither shall thy *land* any more be termed Desolate; but thou shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy *land*

Digitized by Google

Beulah; for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy *land* shall be married." (Isaiah lxii. 5.) Then when "God's sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore" (Ezekiel xxxvii. 28), shall God's great idea be wrought out, "Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord, to which the nations shall be gathered." (Jer. iii. 17.) The land shall become "Immanuel's land," it shall be filled with holiness. and the Divine complacency shall ever rest upon it, "His eyes and his heart shall be there perpetually."

In thus regarding the land of Canaan, we indulge in no superstitious feelings; such respect for God's inheritance is far removed from mere sentimentality. Such thoughts are sober and spiritual, and those who indulge in them are brought into sympathy with God. To "despise this pleasant land," as regards that bright destiny which all the prophets unite in foretelling, argues, in this respect at least, a lack of sympathy with God in his thoughts and purposes.

But where does God's eye and his heart abide *now?* Who are his covenant people in whom He takes pleasure? "Behold, the eye of the Lord is upon them that fear Him, upon them that hope in his mercy!" "To this man will I look who is of a poor and contrite spirit." Such are related to Him. He is "the Lord their God." They choose Him, confide in Him, and feel complacency in his character, and that because He hath loved them with an everlasting love, and with loving-kindness hath drawn them. As the God of their salvation He will supply their need, succour them in sorrow, and save them with an everlasting salvation. Because He was the Lord God of Israel, He provided Canaan for their home, brought them into it, preserved it for their use, for in it they had safety, supply, and satisfaction,—He took pleasure in seeing them happy, because He got glory to his name by their prosperity. And thus He deals with his chosen people now. He provides spiritual blessings; enables them to claim and enjoy them; guards both them and their inheritance, and all "to the praise of the glory of his grace wherein he hath made them accepted in the Beloved;" and "that in the ages to come he *might show* the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us by Christ Jesus." Oh, ye spiritual Israel of God! look up and catch the beamings of your heavenly Father's eye. "Cast all your care on him, *for he careth for you.*" Ever abide where God's eye of delight ever rests, even in his beloved Son. Let that Church, so dear to Him, be much cared for by you, and forget not to care for Israel and her down-trodden land, and then when Israel shall "feed on Bashan and Gilead as in the days of old," and the earth be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, you shall dwell in that heavenly city composed of living stones gathered out of all nations; and which shall for evermore possess the presence of God and the Lamb, to be its light and its glory.

NOTES ON THE PSALMS.

Psalm XXXVIII. *

Here is "the inhabitant saying, I am sick"—David, and every

* By an oversight this Psalm was omitted in its proper place.

Digitized by Google

believer with him, and the Head of all believers, David's son, when he took his place in our world as The Inhabitant who was to heal the sicknesses of others. One writer vehemently asserts, "It is a prophetic prayer of Christ; it has no personal reference whatever to David" (Tucker); while one of the ancient fathers is content with saying, "It would be hard not to apply to Christ a psalm that as graphically describes his passion, as if we were reading it out of the Gospel; Valde durum et contrarium est, ut ille Psalmus non pertineat ad Christum ubi habemus statim tam apertam passionem ejus tanquam ex Evangelio recitetur." (Aug.) We are content to notice that the tone of the voice of him that speaks, is none other than that of the speaker in Psalm vi., as ver. 1 in both is sufficient to prove; nor is it unlike Ps. xxii., as ver. 21 and 22 will at once suggest (Ps. xxii. 29). The difficulty in the way of supposing it used by the Lord Jesus, as descriptive of his feelings and state, when he took on *our guilt by imputation*, is not at all greater than in some passages of Psalms xl. and lxix., which almost no one doubts to be his utterances. Indeed, there is some light cast on our Lord's feelings under the imputation of our sins, if we consider ver. 5 to be a discovery of his abhorrence of the sin he bears: "*My wounds stink and are corrupt*"—there is inexpressible loathsomeness in my festering wounds, those wounds which I have been subjected to, "*because of my foolishness,*"—the folly imputed to me (as in Psa. lxix. 5), the foolishness, the infatuated sins of my people. He was weary of wearing that poisoned garment of our sins; he was weary of having *our leprosy* appearing on his spotless person; he was weary and woe-begone, and longed for the time when he should "*appear without sin.*" (Heb. ix. 28.)

It is thus that we can understand it to have been used by Christ, and yet to be suitable at the same time, though in a different manner, to Christ's redeemed ones, who feel their personal corruption and guilt. And in either case the title is appropriate, "*To bring to remembrance.*" (As in Ps. lxx.) This speaks of God *apparently* forgetting the sufferer, so that a cry ascends, equivalent to, "Lord, remember David and all his afflictions."

What a cry is ver. 1, "*Lord, rebuke me not,*" &c., in the lips of the Head, or of the members. It conveys a foreboding apprehension of another wave of the wrath to come, ready to break over the already bruised soul. "If it be possible, let this cup pass!" What a groan is ver. 2, "*For thine arrows stick fast in me*"—one of those arrows seen on the bow in Psa. vii. 12, arrows that drink up the life-blood. What an overwhelming sight ver. 4 presents, "*Mine iniquities are gone over my head,*"—like the tide rising, when he is within tide-mark. What convulsive agony is depicted in ver. 6, "*I am racked with pain, I am bowed down greatly. Day by day do I go in sadness.*"

How terrible in its calmness, is ver. 9, and 10 also;

"Lord, all my desire is before thee,
And my groaning is not hid from thee.
My heart panteth, my strength faileth,—
The light of mine eyes—even that no longer remains to me;"

for weeping and sorrow have dimmed the eye; a state to which his

Digitized by Google

members have been at times reduced, as when that remarkable disciple in the Highlands of Scotland, *wept herself blind* after her awakening. And then the gloomy cloud closes round Him, ver. 11, "*Lovers and friends stand aloof,*"—sympathy there is none. Nor does his gloom soon pass; for ver. 17 renews the sad complaint,

"I am ready to halt," *i.e.*, to fall and be broken,

for the Keeper of Israel has to appearance forgotten me," and does not "keep my feet from sliding." (Psa. cxxi. 3.)

The deliverance is foreseen in ver. 21, "*Haste to my help;*" and the fulness of it at last is implied and wrapt up in "*O Jehovah, my salvation.*" If *Jehovah* is my salvation, then is He to me what He was to Moses at the Red Sea (Exod. xv. 2), and my triumph is sure and full. The Head and his members have a *salvation* from Jehovah of wondrous extent—beginning in the resurrection of the Head, and to be completed at the resurrection of all the members.

Read, then, in either application, this Psalm describes

The Leprosy of sin abhorred by the righteous.

Psalm XLIV.

There is an apparently intended series, commencing here and extending to Psalm l., wherein the Head is addressed and the various phenomena of his actings described by the *members* of his body. This Psalm, committed to "the Sons of Korah," is the cry of David and any other true followers of the Lord, in times of trial, when the witnesses prophesy in sackcloth. It is not a national Psalm, but one for the Church Universal, inasmuch as ver. 17—22 humbly protest firm, unfaltering adherence to his name; and in Romans viii. 36, Paul has applied it as expressive of the believer's state in a persecuting world.

It is the cry, or appeal, of the slaughtered sheep to their Shepherd. They begin by recalling to mind his great deeds in behalf of his people coming out of Egypt. They lay all the stress of that deliverance on Himself, on his holy arm alone.

"Thou (אַתָּה) *didst drive out the heathen,*" &c.

This "*Thou*" is emphatic, like the pronoun in Ezekiel xxxvii. 3, "Thou (אַתָּה), and none else, knowest;" and then ver. 5, "I (אֲנִי), and none else, will cause the Spirit of life to enter into you." Or like the same pronoun (Rev. iv. 11), "For *thou* (σv), and none else, hast created all things."

Not less significant is that other monosyllable (ver. 9)—

"But (אַף) thou hast cast off"—

It seems to reverse the case stated in Leviticus xxvi. 44, where, after long tribulation, there is hope of the removing of the calamity introduced by וְאַף, which the Jews have marked on this account as "a golden אַף," speaking as it does of a change to prosperity. All

Digitized by Google

different here! The tide has ebbed, and no prospect of its coming in appears! We are sold for the most trifling sum, as if the master were only anxious to get his slaves off his hand. (Ver. 12.)

And yet the sheep own no Shepherd but Jehovah. Their protest is without reserve.

> "*Thou hast broken us,* (and laid us helpless,) *in the place of dragons,*
> *And covered us with the shadow of death,*
> If *we have forgotten the name of our God*—
> *Or* (if) *we have stretched out our hands to a strange God*"—

We are cut off from the society of our fellow-men, we are thrust out into dens and caves, we flee to where serpents are the only inhabitants, we are lingering on the brink of the grave. Yet, we can appeal, "IF we have forgotten!" Here the consequences might have been expected to have been mentioned; but this "IF" expresses the reverse of the sentiment, but in the same form as our Lord's in Luke xix. 42, "IF thou hadst known"—then would blessing have come. It is like Exod. xxxii. 32, "Yet now, *if* thou wilt forgive their sin." It is like Psa. xcv. 7, "To-day, *if* ye will hear his voice"—then ye shall enter into rest.

Having made this protestation, they add, "*But would not God search this out?*" He knoweth all things; He knoweth that we love Him; therefore,

"*Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord?*"

Hope dawns. Their God shall hear. He allows them to awaken Him in a manner, crying through the curtains of his Pavilion, "*Up! why sleepest thou?*" (Prayer-book version). The Banner of the Deliverer appears through the gloom. The sleeping Saviour awakes at the cry of his disciples, and is about to arise and still the storm "for his mercies' sake (ver. 26)—for the sake of the tender love He bears to them.

Such is this Psalm—"*The cry of the slaughtered sheep to the Shepherd.*"

PSALM XLV.

THE appeal made by the sheep led to the slaughter is heard. Here is what Hengstenberg would call a "matter-of-fact reply." The Shepherd at the bleating of his flock appears to help them; but appears in the character of a Mighty Conqueror. The Lamb is the Lion of Judah.

The title given to this Psalm corresponds to its glowing words and theme. "*Upon Shoshannim,*" the lily-instrument, some Temple instrument of music, peculiarly adapting it for the celebration of themes that were fresh and bright and beautiful. "*For the sons of Korah,*" and "*To the Chief Musician:*" the services of the Chief, and the help of the whole choir of singers are put in requisition. It is also "*Maschil,*" what calls for skill as being the product of great

Digitized by Google

skill in the Singer of Israel who writes it, whether he were David or Solomon, and whether or not the *occasion of its composition* were the marriage-festivities of the royal Court. And once more; it is "*A song of loves;*" or rather "*of the Beloved,*" viz., the Bride. At least the word "יְדִידֹת" may mean this. It is used in Jeremiah xii. 7, as a term for Israel while Israel was *God's Beloved,* God's Spouse, He being the Husband; and it corresponds to *Jedidiah,* "beloved of Jehovah," just as *Shulamite* does to *Solomon.* If so, it is a Song concerning *The Bride,* as well as concerning *The King,* the Bridegroom.

"*My heart boils with goodly words.*
My work is for the King!
My tongue is the pen of a ready writer!" (Ver. 1.)

Abrupt and fervent surely—the Holy Spirit thus using the faculties and feelings of the human instrument to indicate the exciting nature of the subject.

"*Thou art beautified with beauty among the sons of men!*"

Another unusual form of speech, to which the next clause is an accompaniment.

"*Grace is poured upon thy lips.*"

Everything that is attractive, everything that is *graceful* in character and form, in feature and expression, is meant by "*grace.*" It is not what we usually call by that name; it is a term for what sits well on the person and draws the eyes of others to him. It is thus used Prov. iv. 9, "She shall give to thy head an ornament of *grace,* a crown of *glory* shall she deliver to thee"—wisdom so clothing the person with *moral* beauty. It is thus, too, in Psalm lxxxiv. 11: "The Lord will give *grace* and *glory*"—the ornament of grace, the crown of glory. All this, in full perfection, is found in Messiah's person; all that is fitted to attract and fix the soul's gaze; all that is beautiful in excellence; all that is drawing in holiness and majestic worth.

This is "*The Mighty One*" (ver. 3) whom Isaiah (ix. 5) calls "The Mighty God." He is the גִּבּוֹר who goes forth to victory, and yet acts in behalf of "meekness and truth and righteousness" (see Rev. xix. 15), or more literally, "in behalf of meekness and truth," the doing which in such a cause is "*righteousness.*" He reaches the throne, and sits down, his enemies made his footstool. Messiah, thus seated on the throne in visible majesty (ver. 6, 7), is addressed:

"*Thy Throne, O God.*
Thy God hath anointed thee, O God!" (Comp. Heb. i. 8, 9, in the Greek.)

Everything is ready for the Marriage: "myrrh and aloes and cassia" (Song iii. 6) have been prepared for this day of Espousals, brought out of "palaces of ivory" to help the joy, or in other words, to complete the mirthful arrangements of this day of heavenly gladness.

Digitized by Google

The "*King's daughters*" who are in attendance, seem to us to be like the "*daughters of Jerusalem*" in the Song; and especially does this portion of the Psalm remind us of Song vi. 8, 9: "The threescore queens, fourscore concubines, and *virgins* without number."

We suspect that both in that Song and here also, these represent *the Angelic hosts,* natives of that heavenly country, not, like *The Bride,* brought into it from a far foreign land. *The Queen* is the redeemed Church, made up of Jew and Gentile saints, the one Body of the redeemed who are referred to in Hebrews xi. 39, 40.

In this view we find no difficulties left. "Be it," sings the sweet singer—"be it that thy princesses who fill thy court are of highest rank, such as are Kings' daughters, yet pre-eminent stands *The Queen* in gold of Ophir! No rival to her! She is honoured, and worthy of honour, above all!"

A pause follows. The Bride is addressed in *prospect of this day.* It is, *q.d.,* "Wilt thou not, since this is thy glorious destiny, be willing to leave all former relationships? Wilt thou not, O daughter, be as Rebecca going to Isaac? This Mighty One is thy *Lord;* be thou as Sarah to Abraham." (Gen. xviii. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 5, 6.)

But the scene is not yet sufficiently set before us. The sweet singer touches his harp again to a lofty strain, to describe the splendour of dominion possessed by the *Bride* in right of the *Bridegroom:*

"*The daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift.*
The rich among THE PEOPLE (עם) *shall entreat thy favour.*"
(Ver. 12.)

This tells of the glorified Church, the Lamb's Wife, ruling over a subdued world, in the millennial days. "*Tyre*" is a sample of *Gentile* nations, and is elsewhere referred to as acting a part in these happy times (see Isa. xxiii. 18); while "the rich among *the People*" are *the Jews* in their restored prosperity. The glorified Church reigns with Christ over the nations upon earth. The glorified Church is with Christ on his throne, wherever that may be, while He rules the people and nations under the whole heaven.

"*The virgins her companions*" are, we think, the same as in verse 9, and as Song vi. 8, "virgins without number"—the angelic hosts. These participate in the joy of this scene, even as they sympathized with the birth of the Bridegroom at Bethlehem.

And (not to dwell too long on verses that tempt us to linger at every step), at last comes the final strain. *The Queen,* or Bride, is addressed in verse 16. It is, like Genesis xxiv. 60 and Ruth iv. 11, the expression of a wish for the after fruitfulness of the *Bride.* The Glorified Church, reigning with Christ, is to see her prayers answered and her labours crowned, in the blessings which shall be poured on earth in these glad millennial days.

"*Instead of thy fathers,*" those who filled earth in thy former days, "*shall be thy children.*" Earth shall have its new generations, generations of holy men,—"*whom thou mayest make princes in all*

Digitized by Google

the earth"—every one fit to be a prince, the weakest among them as David, and the House of David as the Angel of the Lord.

"*So shall the nations praise thee for ever and ever!*"

This ends the loftiest Epithalamium ever sung. It is what Milton would call

"The unexpressive nuptial song
In the blest kingdom meek of joy and love."

It is Earth, taught by heaven to sing heaven's infinite love to man. It is a prelude to the New Song. Every clause in it is melody, and every thought in it is sublimity; but it is just such as we might expect to be breathed forth when the theme on hand was—

"*The Mighty One appearing as the Bridegroom.*"

Psalm XLVI.

Before the dawn of that day of the Bridegroom and the Bride, the Marriage-feast, earth shall shake with commotions; wars, rumours of wars, earthquakes, famines, pestilence, all combining to make men perplexed. But here we find the same *Mighty One* giving strength to his own in these perilous times.

The title is peculiar, "*on Alamoth,*" suggesting "a choir of *virgins,*" as if this virgin-choir were selected to sing a Psalm that tells of a time wherein perils and fears and alarms abound, in order to show that even they may in that day sing without dread because of "*The Mighty One*" on their side. They and the "Sons of Korah" join in this lofty strain of confidence.

They sing of Jehovah "*a very present help,*" or more literally, "*He is found a help most truly,*" נִמְצָא, being the same word here as in 1 Sam. xiii. 16, "*present* with Saul;" 2 Chron. xxxv. 18, "Judah and Israel *present,*" or found at their post; and 1 Sam. xxi. 3, "whatever is *present*"—is "found"—is at hand.

The river in ver. 4 alludes to the Euphrates of Babylon and the Tigris of Assyria. Jerusalem has not such mighty floods to boast of. Yet Jerusalem has נָהָר too. She has her "*waters of Siloah,*" flowing softly from her Temple (Isa. viii. 6—8), which may be despised by men of might, yet are Jerusalem's glory. Her glory is, that Jehovah is her Temple, beneath whose rock flows out Siloah; and thus "a river is there" that gladdens this city of God. Or, if this be not the primary reference, the allusion is to this same *Siloah* when it shall flow from the Temple (see Joel iii. 18; Isa. xxxiii. 21; Ezek. xlvii. 1—16), and shall heal whatever it laves; far better than the mighty waters of Euphrates and Hiddekel, bearing the proud gallies of tyrants.

Victory shall come as soon as the Lord's set time arrives; "*when morning appears,*" as at the Red Sea. (Exod. xiv. 27.) The Lord himself shall invite men to see his victory: "*Come and see!*" (ver. 8),

Digitized by Google

and to hear Him proclaim his own right to exaltation. At this announcement, his people shout in reply,

"The Lord of hosts is with us!
The God of Jacob is our refuge!"

Thus appropriating

"*The Mighty One on their side, amid earth's sorest throes.*"

Psalm XLVII.

And now the Mighty One is seated peacefully on his throne. We are referred back to Psalm xlv. 9. His happy people stand around, exulting in his coronation, as Israel (to use a feeble emblem) rejoiced till earth rang again, when *Athaliah*, the usurper, was deposed, and the King of David's line was manifested after his long concealment. Then they clapt their hands (2 Kings xi. 12) to show their rapturous joy, as here all earth is invited to do; for even woods and trees and rivers are represented as joining in this ecstacy of bliss (Isa. lv. 12; Ps. xcviii. 9), when our King sets the new earth in its regenerated order.

Verses 2, 3, 4, show what the King has come to do, and to be; and resting over this blissful scene, the Psalmist inserts his "*Selah*" —a pause of meditation. But ver. 5 breaks the thoughtful silence with a shout to our Immanuel—for He it is who is celebrated as "God"—

"*Sing praises to God!*
Sing praises!
Sing praises to our King!
Sing praises!
For God is King over all the earth!
Sing praises with understanding.
God reigneth over the nations!
God sitteth upon the throne of his holiness!"

Around our Incarnate God and King are gathered Israel's princes— "princes of the *God of Abraham*"—Abraham's seed now receiving in full the blessings promised to their father, all earth blest in him. And everywhere, "*the shields of earth,*" earth's princes, who once, like "the shields" mentioned in Hosea iv. 18, instead of defending their people, robbed and preyed on them, now gather round our God to receive authority from Him and use it for Him. He is King of kings. He is Lord of lords. And this is the enthusiastic celebration of

"*The Righteous One on the throne.*"

Psalm XLVIII.

The subject of the Mighty One's history is still continued. The Mighty One is King, has entered on his dominion, is seated on his throne, is ruling in righteousness. But where is his capital? It is at

Digitized by Google

Jerusalem. Here He manifests himself, and by the glory of his presence shed over that "City of the Great King," brighter than the light of seven days, yet far more mellow and tranquillizing than the sweetest hues of evening, *Jerusalem* becomes

> "*The joy of the whole earth.*
> (The joy) *of the cities of the north.*"

The joy of earth, far and near, the source of joy to earth's remotest bounds. Now is fulfilled Isaiah xxiv. 23. Now is Jerusalem made "beautiful for situation," or, set aloft on its hills in beauty, in another sense than formerly. Now is Zion exalted above the mountains, and obtains established pre-eminence above the hills.

And if associations are needed to make any place completely interesting, these are not wanting here. Such deeds have been done here, that Sennacherib's overthrow is, in a manner, cast into the shade. The gathered kings of earth came up, and the Lord scattered them, and intimates here his "*Veni, vidi, vici,*" to all nations.

> "*They saw !*
> *They marvelled !*
> *They were troubled !*
> *They hasted away !*" (Ver. 5.)

It was as when an east wind hurls the ships of Tarshish on the rocks. (Ver. 7.) It comprised in it all that is recorded as wonderful in the achievements of former days.

> "As we *have heard*, so *have we seen*,
> In the city of the Lord of hosts." (Ver. 8.)

The *Selah-pause* occurs here, and then we look out on a peaceful scene, God known in all the earth, Zion glad, Judah's tears wiped away, while a voice invites all men to come and survey the bulwarks of the city of the Great King, that they may tell it from age to age. The bulwarks are strong, for the Lord's presence, *Jehovah Shammah*, is the wall of fire, on whose battlements the happy citizens walk in security, singing,

> "*This God is our God for ever and ever ;*
> *He is our guide even over death.*"

The last clause is much misunderstood. It is not, "our guide *unto* death," for the words are יְנַהֲגֵנוּ עַל מוּת, "shall lead us *over death.*" Surely it means, "It is He who leads over *death* to *resurrection*"— over Jordan into Canaan. The עַל is used in Levit. xv. 25 for "BEYOND," in regard to time, and is not this the sense here? "*Beyond* the time of death?" Till death is to us over? Till we have *stood upon the grave of death ?* Yes ; He it is who leads us on to this last victory ; He swallows up death in victory, and leads us to *trample on death.* And so viewed, we easily see the beautiful link of thought that joins this Psalm to that which follows.

Digitized by Google

Such is the celebration of "*the Mighty One become the glory of Jerusalem.*"

Psalm XLIX.

The Mighty One never rests till he has "*led us over death*" (xlviii. 14) to resurrection-fulness of bliss in the kingdom. Thrice happy they who shall enjoy it! But who shall tell the misery of those who are excluded from that bliss? It is this misery that is the theme of this Psalm. As sure as the eternal felicity of the redeemed, is the doom of the unredeemed; and this Psalm is the dirge over them.

The Redeemer himself speaks this "*parable,*" this weighty discourse, which in its topics is to the world no better than an unintelligible enigma—"*a dark saying.*" But, nevertheless, "these things which have been kept secret from the beginning" (Matt. xiii. 38), are here laid open in their solemn grandeur, in their awful importance, in their truth and certainty. Messiah here speaks "*wisdom*" (חָכְמוֹת) and "*understanding,*" as in Prov. i. 20, revealing the deep things of God to man. It is Messiah who says (ver. 5), "*Wherefore should I fear in the days of evil, when iniquity at my heels doth compass me about?*" Messiah in our world of evil, pursued by sons of Belial, surrounded by the troops of hell, breathing the atmosphere of this polluted world, walking amid its snares, is able to break through all, and foretel impending ruin to every foe.

Man has no means of paying to God his ransom-money (Exod. xxi. 30), although he bring the most costly price earth can furnish. He "must *let that alone for ever*" (Prayer-book Version); he cannot come up to the amount demanded; he cannot give even what might be sufficient to redeem *the life* from the grave. See how generations die, disappear, give place to other generations, all equally the prey of corruption; and yet fools continue to hope for immortality for themselves. Think of this infatuation; pause, meditate; the harp will be silent for a time that you may ponder it—"*Selah!*"

But lift the veil! Where are these sons of folly? In the grave; "*death leads them into his pastures,*" as his sheep (Hengstenberg); and

"*The righteous have dominion over them in the morning.*
Their beauty consumes away;
The grave is the dwelling for every one of them." (Ver. 14.)

The *First Resurrection* is described by these few strokes, the resurrection of the just. They live and *reign*—have dominion—while "*the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years* are finished." (Rev. xx. 5.) And to stifle doubts in their birth, the Redeemer declares himself sure of resurrection; and if He, then they also, for He is the first fruits, the pledge of theirs.

"*Surely,* (אַךְ) *God shall redeem my soul from the hand of the grave;*
For He shall receive me." (Ver. 15.)

Receive me as Enoch was received, received up to glorious rest. (See

Digitized by Google

Gen. v. 24, the same word, לָקַח.) Hear, therefore, the sum of the whole matter. The ungodly shall never see "*the light*" of that "*morning*" (ver. 14); yea (ver. 20), "*man in prosperity*," even Antichrist in the flush of his power, "is like the beasts; *he is to be rooted* out" (Hengst.)—he has no lot or portion with the blessed.

In such strains the Redeemer himself utters His melancholy

"*Dirge over the unredeemed.*"

Psalm L.

Arrived at the end—having sung of the elect's cry, the response to their cry in the Mighty One's appearing, the Mighty One's protection, the throne on which He sits, the city where his glory abides and Himself in the glory,—having, also, sung that melancholy dirge over those who have no portion in the lot of the righteous—the Psalmist is led by the Spirit to strike his harp to one other strain of kindred nature. He here sets forth the *principles of judgment* that guide the decision of *the King* "who sits on the throne of his holiness."

The glory of the Lord, and the gathering of the saints around Him (the *ἐπισυναγωγη ἐπ' αὐτον* of 2 Thess. ii. 1) being celebrated in ver. 1—6, and the *Selah*-pause having given us time to fix our eye upon the scene, *the Lord* suddenly speaks, reasoning with men as to their wrong ideas of the way of salvation (ver. 7—15), and their sinful practice (ver. 16—22). Man treats God as if He were a Being to be ministered unto, instead of a gracious, sovereign Benefactor. Man acts in the view of God as if the holy God were such an one as himself. But the end comes. None shall enter into glory, none be shown "*the salvation of God*," *i.e.*, his glorious completed redemption (such as Paul spoke of, Rom. xiii. 11, and Peter, 1 Pet. i. 5) at the Lord's appearing, excepting the man who "*orders his conversation aright;*" that is, who regulates his life by the rule of verse 5, in other words, by Gospel-rule, who prepares his way according to the preparation revealed to him by the Lord. The man who would so do must begin at the altar (ver. 5), there "*offering praise*," even as ver. 14 also declared; he must begin by owning Jehovah's benefits to us sinners, responding to the song of the angels at Bethlehem over a Saviour born, and answering the Saviour's cry, "*It is finished*," by his soul's glad acceptance of that finished work. This is the great step in the way—this is the "*ordering of the conversation*"—and to declare this is the object of this Psalm. It sets forth, at the lips of the Righteous Judge himself,

The principles of judgment at the In-gathering of the Saints.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

Matt. xvii. 1—8.

The disciples of our Lord, in common with the Jews, cherished false conceptions respecting the design of Christ's first advent. We do not

Digitized by Google

conceive their notions of Christ to be—as is sometimes alleged—"carnal," or altogether unscriptural. Their error consisted in fixing their attention upon that class of prophecies which pointed to his second coming—to his regal power and glory; and in overlooking those which told of his humiliation and crucifixion. Consequently they looked forward with delightful emotions to a bright era in the history of their Lord, when He was to be arrayed in all the habiliments of royalty—when He was to ascend the Throne, to sway the sceptre, and to number among his subjects the nobles and princes of many lands. In this scene of pomp and splendour they never doubted but they themselves would occupy elevated stations, and act a very prominent part. To persons entertaining such views, and cherishing such hopes, the circumstances in which the Saviour appeared must have been very perplexing. They could not conceive why the Messiah promised to their fathers, should be oppressed with poverty—why He should be the object of the foulest scorn and fiercest persecution. This wonderful event, therefore, of our Lord's Transfiguration was undoubtedly designed by Him to rectify their views by showing them that He must needs suffer, and die, according to the intimation of the law and the prophets—that glory would certainly succeed his sufferings—and that his servants should be glorified with Him. What the three favoured disciples witnessed on this occasion would strengthen their faith in Christ, and in his future triumphant kingdom. Believing the Transfiguration of Christ is designed to strengthen the faith, and encourage the hope of the Church, let us approach it with a sincere desire to learn the lessons the scene is fitted to teach. "After six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." (Matt. xvii. 1—5.)

The hallowed spot where the scene occurred, is, by tradition, said to be Mount Tabor. Whether it was Tabor, or some other mount near Galilee, may be difficult, and certainly not important, to determine. Tabor might be called, by emphasis, "an high mountain." It had upon its summit a flat peculiarly suited to the event. And perhaps in our allusions to the mount of transfiguration, we may still be permitted to designate it Mount Tabor.

Contemplate,—

1. *The glorious majesty of Christ.*—He "was transfigured before them, and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Mark, the Evangelist, says, "His raiment became shining, exceedingly white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can white them." St. Luke adds, "The fashion of his countenance was changed, and his

raiment was white and glistering." The glory in which He thus appeared beamed in his face, pierced through his raiment, and surrounded his whole person with the most dazzling splendour. With what delightful as well as awful emotions would the three chosen disciples gaze upon the ineffable brightness of their Lord! They had beheld Him just before, in all respects in fashion as a man, his visage marred more than any man's, and his form more than the sons of men, bearing an impress of the grief and anguish of soul, which rendered Him pre-eminently a Man of sorrows. But now He shines before them, bright with irradiations of glory; such, but with softened effulgence, as Stephen afterwards saw Him in vision at the right hand of God; or as Saul beheld Him, when He appeared in a brightness above the noon-day sun; or as John in Patmos beheld Him; or as He shall be beheld "when He comes to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe."

We have on the Mount,—

I. *An exhibition of Christ's pre-existent glory.*—All the manifestations of Deity in ancient times were those of the Son, not of the Father. This is evident from express declarations on this subject. Our Lord himself said, "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and *he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.*" (Matt. xi. 27.) Again: "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father." (John vi. 46.) Still more directly he says, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, *he hath declared him.*" (John i. 18.) All the personal manifestations of Jehovah from the beginning were those of the second person in the Godhead. This Divine Person appeared to our first parents "walking in the garden in the cool of the day." He is that very "God of glory" who, as Stephen said, appeared to Abraham (Acts vii. 2); who also appeared to Isaac, Jacob, and Manoah and his wife; and whom she also designated "the man with a terrible," or rather "majestic countenance." He also appeared unto a large number of the elders of Israel. For we read in the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus, and from the ninth to the eleventh verse, that "Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand: *also they saw God.*" The prophet Isaiah "*saw* the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up." He also heard the *anticipative* and *prophetic* song of the seraphim, "*The whole earth is full of his glory.*" The beautiful vision, as recorded by Ezekiel, is very definite. "And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone; and upon the likeness of a throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it. And I saw as the colour of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward,

Digitized by Google

I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake." (Ezek. i. 26—28.) Let us now pass from these splendid scenes to *that* exhibited upon Mount Tabor. We behold there a manifestation of that glory which had been seen by the patriarchs and the prophets—yea, that very glory which our Saviour had from eternal ages. Peter, James, and John, therefore, who were eye-witnesses of the Transfiguration, might then be said to see Him in that glory which He had with the Father before the world was, when He was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God. When they saw Him arrayed in this heavenly splendour, they might be said to see Him in the likeness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his Father's person. By this, they would see that He was God manifested in the flesh—that his name was Immanuel, God with us; and they would be ready to exclaim, The tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and be their God. That the disciples did put this interpretation upon the vision is to be inferred from the words of John, where he says, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

The glory in which He appeared was not shed on Him externally; it was not borrowed glory; it was emphatically his own glory, and had existed in Him from all eternity. We behold in the face of Moses, as he descends from Mount Sinai, a borrowed glory, like that of the moon; but on Mount Tabor we behold the inherent glory of the Sun of Righteousness. Rays of this hidden glory had already, at times, emanated from Him, in acts of omnipotence and mercy, so that all were struck with astonishment, and said, What manner of man is this, and from whence is He? But there was such an outward manifestation of his hidden glory and majesty on Mount Tabor as had never been before revealed. And this inexpressible splendour would fully convince the witnesses that He was the Sun of Righteousness—the light of the world, and the Lord of glory.

II. *We have on the Mount an exhibition of that glory which Christ will manifest when he comes to reward every man according to his works.* The Transfiguration is preceded by a sublime prediction of his second coming. They are linked together by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the prediction must be read, in order to understand more clearly the import of the Transfiguration. "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels: and then He shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be *some* standing here, *which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.*" Who were the persons that should not taste death till they had seen the Son of Man coming in his kingdom? We answer—Peter, James, and John. Were they to live upon the earth till Christ came to judge the world? Assuredly not.

Digitized by Google

The coming to which our Lord referred, and which they were to see before they tasted of death, was the event that followed. About "six days after, Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was *transfigured before them.*" *Now* they behold Him in the glory of his second coming. What a scene! As we gaze upon it, we behold the splendour and majesty of Christ in his kingdom. The Transfiguration may be regarded as an ocular prophecy of his second coming. There are in the Scriptures, ocular, as well as verbal, prophecies. For example, when the Psalmist saith, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer thine holy one to see corruption," there was a prophecy in words of the resurrection of Christ. But when Jonah, after he had been "three days and three nights in the whale's belly," was vomited upon shore, there was an ocular prophecy of the same glorious doctrine—the resurrection of Christ. Again, when Daniel said, "the Messiah should be cut off, but not for himself," there was a verbal prophecy of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus. But when Moses "took a lamb and slew it, and sprinkled the door-post with the blood," there was an ocular prophecy of the vicarious death of Christ our Passover. So, when our Saviour said to his listening disciples in the 27th verse of the preceding chapter, "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father," &c., there was a verbal prophecy of the second coming of Christ in glory. But when He was transfigured before them, and "his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light," there was an ocular prophecy of the same grand event—the second coming of Christ. And this interpretation of the Transfiguration is well supported by the Apostle Peter, one of the witnesses. Ponder his heart-stirring words, "If ye do these things"—things which he had just named—"ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. . . . . For we have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Now did the apostle prove that the coming of Christ, which he had made known, and was resolved to make known, until he put off his tabernacle, was not a cunningly devised fable? Why; by declaring that he and the two other disciples, James and John, "*were eye-witnesses of his majesty.*" They had ocular proof of his coming. "For he received from God the Father honour and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in *the holy mount.*" This is Peter's own interpretation of the Transfiguration. He compares Christ's glory and majesty on the holy mount to that which He will reveal in his final advent, and considers the former as a proof—a pledge of the latter.

(*To be continued.*)

Digitized by Google

Reviews.

Enoch. London: Bateman. *Noah.* London: Bateman. 1851.

These are two of a series of little works in which, while there is much that is truly excellent and spiritual, there is such a straining after what is new, that the reader is both disappointed and annoyed. For instance, in the first of the two, Lamech is represented as a man of singular faith, full of "true Gospel intelligence," and "true Gospel simplicity." In his speech to his wives, "he is of the very mind and temper of Paul; his confidence and victory are apostolic" (p. 25); "his faith takes a glorious sight of the whole mystery, and of the boundlessness and of the riches of grace!" The writer denies that Lamech was a murderer, without, of course, attempting any proof of an assertion, so wholly in the face of Scripture. He says, "I do not assume that Lamech was a murderer, but he could identify himself with such." (P. 26). If, however, he was not a murderer, he was a polygamist. But how any one reverencing the Word of God could throw out such an idea, we do not understand. It shows us that ill-regulated spirituality can go quite as far as Rationalism in making void the simplicity of God's truth. We do not remember to have read in any German critic so sad a contradiction to a Divine statement. Because the writer thinks that Lamech was a type of the repentant Jewish remnant of the latter day, therefore he must have been a man of faith, and not a murderer, only "identifying himself with murderers!"

Remains of the Rev. W. Howels. Second Edition. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1852.

The second edition of a most valuable volume. "Each word of thine was a thunderbolt," said Melancthon of Luther. (Fulmina erant linguæ singula verba tuæ.) By some such figure may the words of Mr. Howels be described. He was a noble specimen of bold and manly honesty, as well as of high spirituality and power. Ministers might gather much from such a work as this. How refreshing such a sentiment as the following in these last days of laxity and indifference to the truth:—"Associate not with Socinians. I have relations who are Socinians, but I do not, I could not sit at table with them; nevertheless they love me, and I love them; and they respect me the more for being faithful to my principles." (P. 236.)

Choice Sentences; or, Recollections of the Ministry of the Rev. W. Howels. London: J. F. Shaw.

In the brief notice of Mr. Howels, prefixed to this, the following striking statement occurs:—"He was a gifted man. Soon after his ordination his Rector is reported to have asked his flock to pray that

Digitized by Google

the Lord would be pleased to lay thorns enough in the path of that young man, that he might go safely on." The volume, though small, is an excellent one. Its "sentences" are indeed "choice."

Memoir and Remains of the Rev. J. H. Evans. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1852.

Wishing that more pains had been taken with the first part of this volume, we mean the Memoir, still we can hardly express too strongly our appreciation of the latter part. The "Remains" are indeed beyond all price. The letters are truly apostolical, yet so thoroughly pervaded with the kindly and loving genialities of a tender spirit, that they form the best and most attractive specimens of spiritual Christianity that can be found. The volume is a very valuable one indeed, yet we cannot forego the hope that by a little pains it may be made more valuable still. We extract a paragraph from the unfinished Commentary on Ephesians, at the close of the volume:—

"It is *in Him* that all the broken fabrics of this once glorious fabric are to be gathered together (vers. 3—7), to form *one* habitation, united by *one* corner-stone, settled on one foundation. But what a display of wisdom and suitableness is here, that He who had united the human nature to the Godhead in His own person, should thus unite the whole Church to God in Himself. On earth no one was fit for its accomplishment, in heaven *there was but One.* But who can set forth the love which it displays? Behold the great mystery of the Gospel, the whole election of grace gathered together with God in Christ, all united in Him, not only man restored to *himself*, and above all to *God*, but man restored to *man*, Jew united to Gentile, and all united unto God. And not man alone, man and angels shall be gloriously united into the same family, filled with the same love, adore and serve the same God in Christ, and that for ever and ever. It is true Jesus stands not in the same relation to angels as He does to man, He took not their nature, He is no Goel-Redeemer to them. To them He is no Husband, no Saviour, no Substitute. The Church composed of once fallen, but redeemed and sanctified creatures, is His royal Queen, yet do angels with them form one assembly, one family. (Heb. xii. 22, 23.) Jesus their mutual Head. (Eph. i. 21, 22; Col. ii. 10.) Angels rejoice over souls converted and brought into His kingdom (Luke xv. 10); fall down before Him. (Heb. i. 6; Rev. vii. 11.) Behold, then, the mystery! What a glorious plan, even here the union begins,—'Saints in heaven, and saints on earth, but one communion make.' These form the whole family in heaven and in earth, they have but one song, one salvation, one portion. What a gathering will that be, though now it be by ones and twos, in small and scattered masses; but what a glorious consummation will that be of the wondrous scheme, and the final close, the last scene of the grand drama exhibited, when the whole earth shall be filled with His glory, and heaven with His ceaseless, eternal, never-ending praise."

Charity and its Fruits. By Jonathan Edwards. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1852.

This volume consists of sixteen lectures on the thirteenth chapter of first Corinthians, now for the first time published from the original manuscripts. All of them are good, some truly admirable. They

Digitized by Google

contain an immense amount of thoroughly practical matter, brought out and applied with all the author's wonderful powers of intellectual and spiritual discrimination.

The Lord's Short Work on the Earth; A Sermon. By R. S. CANDLISH, D.D. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. 1852.

ELOQUENT, solemn, powerful. A sermon for the times and for the land. Take the following specimen:—

"Look abroad on European Christendom. Contemplate the nations that have so long and so desperately rebelled against the Lord and against his Christ,—disowning his blessed Gospel, and doing homage, whether in doting superstition or in the hypocrisy of atheism, to his arch-enemy, the Antichrist, the Man of Sin. Is it not the universal observation concerning the occurrences of the last few years and months, that they bear a most judgment-like aspect and character? They have got utterly beyond all the ordinary conditions of political calculation. They baffle and defy the profoundest sagacity of political wisdom, alike to anticipate them beforehand, and to account for them or estimate and measure them when they come. Nor is there any feature in the case that more signally and unequivocally marks their judicial import, than the haste and hurry with which crisis after crisis, and stroke after stroke, breathlessly follow one another. The vicissitudes of a century seem to be crowded now into the compass of a decade, nay, almost of a single year. The marvels of all history, ancient and modern, are enacted again before our eyes, with even enhanced elements of surprise,—and all in such brief space as may be counted by weeks, and even by days. Is it not the impression of all thoughtful minds that there is an ominous acceleration of the rate of movement in the revolutionary ongoings of Papal Europe? It is as if the impulse of railway locomotion, and the electric transmission of intelligence from shore to shore, were communicated to the excited minds of men, or exemplified in the angry providence of God. Surely it is a short work that the Lord is making on the earth. At this moment, what a spectacle does the Continent present! And what fear of change is perplexing all hearts! Peace the princes boast of, and order re-established and restored. Peace and order! Excellent blessings truly;—Heaven's best gifts to weary mortals! But to be blessings, they must be Heaven's gifts; flowing from the liberty with which Christ makes his people free, founded on just laws and equal rights, and hallowed by the recognition of the true God, and the utter overthrow of every idol;—not bought by a sordid compromise with Rome, and upheld by the suppression of all free opinion and the sanguinary arm of military power. As it is, who doubts that a new crash is near at hand? The unholy alliance of despotism and Popery cannot be long tolerated, either by earth or by heaven. It is filling up the iniquity of the Papacy, and of the powers and principalities that are giving their influence to the Beast. It is putting the last drop into the cup of bitterness, even now ready to overflow. It is preparing the way for the terrible reaction when the exasperated nations, stung to frenzy by the double oppression of Pope and Cæsar, shall hate the scarlet mother of abominations, and make her desolate and naked, and eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. (Rev. xvii. 16.) Above all, it is calling aloud for God to come swiftly to the reckoning, and to make short work of his final dealings with the Antichristian powers that have so long made the earth to groan and bleed. We may well be looking out for a rapid development of this new and unheard-of combination against the liberties and hopes of mankind. Already the isolated remnants of the free,—in the Swiss mountains, the valleys of Piedmont, and the plains of Sardinia,—are trembling for their very being. The lowering storm of priestly and despotic vengeance may burst on them at any moment. And the patience of God being

Digitized by Google

exhausted suddenly, the fury of his wrath may come ere we think it possible. 'He will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness,—a short work will he make upon the earth.'"

In opposition to the unhealthy and unscriptural sentimentalism of those who will hear of nothing but peace, who look upon warlike preparations as wholly unchristian, and upon the military profession as unbecoming a saint, we have the following noble appeal:—

"At the same time, in the third place, Stand prepared and on the watch for these things coming to pass, and 'when they begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.' (Luke xxi. 28.) Meanwhile, yield not to imaginary visions and premature dreams of security and repose, as if the world were grown too old and wise for the barbarism of war, and the sword were now everywhere to be sheathed amid the acclamations and congratulations of universal brotherhood. The horrors of war—the benefits of peace—it is impossible to exaggerate. But let us have a care lest we so deal with that great theme as to enervate and paralyze the hearts and hands of the free, while the military despots that are ready to scourge the earth exult in the spurious sentiment, or false economy, that would disarm the defenders of truth and liberty, left now well-nigh a mere remnant in the Thermopylæ of our Western world. What! When all Europe, under the sway of rampant tyranny and intolerant priestcraft, is bristling with the implements and resounding with the smothered din of battle, is it for the forlorn hope, on which the good cause must mainly depend, to become enamoured of repose, and grasp too soon the millennial blessedness of peace? It has been the Lord's will formerly,—and if the Revelation be a true prophecy, it may be the Lord's will again,—to accomplish his great ends of judgment and mercy, through the instrumentality of wars and tumults,—and these no child's play. From all unjust and unnecessary recourse to arms—from all unholy violence of speech or action—from all that wrath of man which worketh not the righteousness of God—may the nation and its people be preserved! But for the needful testimony, and the needful conflict,—whether on the field of physical power, or on the ground of faithful witness-bearing, even to persecution and bloody martyrdom,—let the champions of independence and the soldiers of the Cross stand prepared. Let them watch in full armour and with unslumbering eye, lest that day of the Lord's short work on the earth should overtake them suddenly as a thief in the night."

The Winter Night; showing plainly the Blindness wherein we were misled by Popery, &c. Written in the year 1589, and first published under the title, Ane Godly Treatise, called the First and Second Coming of Christ, with the time of the winter night, showing briefly our native blindness. By James Anderson, minister of the Evangile at Collace. Reprinted at Edinburgh. 1851.

This is a very old and curious Scottish poem, written by one who was looking and longing for the appearing of his Lord. Its poetry is not high, but its spirit and tone are those of the believer possessed of the "blessed hope." He speaks as one who realized his Lord "at the door." It shows how the subject had taken hold of our Reformers.

De Vicinitate Extremi Judicii: libri duo, Authore, Joanne Frederico Lumnio. Antverpiæ. 1594.

This is another work of the sixteenth century, which shows how

Digitized by Google

extensively the idea of the nearness of the Lord's coming had taken hold of that age. It is a work of 270 pages, and, from some allusions, evidently written by a Romanist.

The Dreadful Signs of Christ's Second Coming, calmly considered. London. 1755.

This is a small pamphlet of thirty pages, in which, though there is nothing very striking, yet there is much that is solemn, fitted to rouse a careless and slumbering world.

Remarks on the Prophecies relating to the Restoration of the Jews. By M. S. M. London: Painter, Strand.

What will the readers of this Journal think of their own presumption after perusing the following *dictum*, p. 8, of this pamphlet? "*It is equally reprehensible to attempt to interpret prophecies before their fulfilment, as it is to shut our eyes wilfully against the signs of the times when the events do appear.*" And what are we to think of the writer's theology when he sees nothing startling and *disingenuous* in the principle on which he would account for our Lord allowing the disciples (as he admits he did) to go away with the idea of Israel's future restoration after the question, Acts i. 7, 8. "*Had He satisfied their worldly-minded inquiry in the negative it might have discouraged them from enduring the hardships they had to undergo for the truth's sake.*" The author seems sincere and convinced of his own views, but never deals in *arguments*, content with telling us his *opinions*.

Contributions towards the Exposition of the Book of Genesis. By R. S. Candlish, D.D. Vol. II. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. 1852.

It is now eight years since Dr. Candlish published the first volume of these Contributions; and those who have read that work with the relish and admiration which are its due, must have felt some impatience to get hold of the second. It has now found its way to us; and most fully does it sustain the author's well-earned name as an expositor of the Word of God. Had we room for large criticism, we might show wherein we differ, and wherein this second volume comes short of the first. But we must not enter into details. Under a very modest title, we are presented with a book, not only full of fine and original expositions of the Word of God, but strewed with rich thoughts, getting vent to themselves in an easy but vigorous and powerful style. We give our readers one specimen. It is respecting this earth being the future dwelling of the redeemed, and Canaan as Abraham's resurrection-inheritance :—

Digitized by Google

"Let it be well remembered and considered, that the only hope connected with the future world, which Abraham had, was bound up in the promise that he was himself personally to inherit the land. When he went out, at the call of God, not knowing whither he went, it was upon the faith of his receiving an inheritance. When he came into Canaan, he was expressly told that this was the country destined to be his inheritance. But he was also informed that while his descendants, four hundred years after, would possess the land, he was to have no inheritance in it on this side of the grave, 'He was to go to his fathers in peace, and to be buried in a good old age.' (Ch. xv. 15.) Still he had the outstanding promise that he himself personally was to inherit that land. He believed, and continued to believe, that promise. But he learned to interpret it as a promise to be fulfilled, not in the life that now is, but in the life that is to come. For he knew that though he was to die before he obtained possession of the land,—and so far God might seem to fail in fulfilling the promise on the faith of which he had called him out of Charran,—still that God was able to raise him from the dead, and to fulfil the promise in the resurrection state, or, in other words, in the world to come. He acquiesced in that arrangement. He was reconciled to it. He rejoiced in it. He would willingly consent to the postponement of the promise, so that he should have his inheritance in the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, rather than in this earthly Canaan, as it now subsists, where, at the very best, all is vanity.

"Still, let it be observed, it is the promise of that very earthly Canaan which alone is the foundation of Abraham's hope for eternity. There is no trace, no hint, in all the patriarch's history, of any other promise whatever, relating to the world to come. It is scarcely possible to entertain a doubt upon this point. What Abraham was taught to expect was the inheritance of the very soil on which he trod, for so many long years of pilgrimage, as a mere stranger and sojourner. It was to be his at last.

"Nor was it to belong to him in any remote and indirect sense merely,—and as he might be held to be represented by a nation that after all never got full and absolute possession of it. For the Israelites, at the best, were but tenants in the land—tenants at will, upon their good behaviour, as God expressly testifies, using the very expression: 'The land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.' (Lev. xxv. 23.) It was to himself personally that the land was to be given as an inheritance—to himself, as an individual believer, and as it were in his own right. That very land was to be his inheritance. But when? Not in this state of being, in which man is himself mortal, and the ground is cursed for man's sake. But in that other state of being, in which this mortal has put on immortality, and the face of this earth is renewed.

"Yes! it is when death is swallowed up in victory—it is when the dead in Christ are raised—it is when this globe, already baptized with water, has undergone its final baptism of fire—it is then that the patriarch is to possess that land. And then at last in the possession of it,—being himself raised incorruptible, and receiving his portion in the renovated earth—receiving it, moreover, for an everlasting inheritance,—then is he to reap the reward of all his work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope here below, in God's open acknowledgment of him as a son, and therefore an heir—an heir of God, and joint-heir with Christ,—as well as in the full enjoyment of God throughout the ages of eternity.

"Such, as it would seem, was Abraham's high and heavenly hope—a hope heavenly, in one sense, as having respect to the world to come—the heavenly or resurrection state; but yet, in another sense, having a substantial local habitation in the new earth, in which, as well as in the new heavens, righteousness is to dwell.

"And now, does not this hope give a peculiar and very precious meaning to Abraham's determination that Sarah shall not be buried in a strange, or in a

Digitized by Google

hired, or even in a lent or gifted tomb, but in a sepulchre, most strictly and absolutely his own? He is taking infeftment in his inheritance. It belongs not to him living. But it belongs to him, and to his, when dead. While he is alive in this world, he has no interest in the land, but to walk in it as a stranger and pilgrim—to 'walk before God, and be perfect.' But death gives to him, and to his, a title to it; and he will vindicate that title for his dead. Living, he can but use it as the strange country of his pilgrimage; but when dead, he claims all a proprietor's right in it, and his kindred dust is entitled to repose in it as a home." (Pp. 234—237.)

Extracts.

Verbal Inspiration.

"'PARADISE LOST' contains not only Milton's *thoughts*, but Milton's *words*. So the Bible gives us not only the *thoughts*, but the *words* of God. Indeed, if it did not give us the *latter*, it could not give us the *former*. Man *cannot* clothe the thoughts of God in fitting words. He cannot clothe even the thoughts of a fellow-man in adequate words; much less the thoughts of God. Could Milton have trusted his amanuensis to throw his thoughts into words? Can God trust man to embody *his* thoughts in fitting words? He who does not believe that the Bible contains God's words *cannot* believe that it contains God's thoughts. In other words, we must either have verbal inspiration or none at all."—*Anon.*

Our Citizenship.

"A CITIZEN of the new Jerusalem travelling homewards is our daily standing, and our real position. Everything below that, is below ourselves and our high calling, which is our being called to GLORY as well as *virtue.*"—*Evans.*

The Last Days.

"THE days are evil; iniquity aboundeth; Christian charity groweth cold. Therefore we ought the more diligently to watch, for the hour is uncertain when the Lord Jesus shall appear."—*John Knox.*

The Lord's Coming.

"SIGH and long for the dawning of that morning, and the breaking of that day of the coming of the Son of man, when the shadows shall flee away. Persuade yourself the King is coming. Read his letter sent before Him—'Behold, I come quickly.' Wait with the wearied night-watch for the breaking of the eastern sky, and THINK THAT YE HAVE NOT A MORROW."—*Rutherford.*

Digitized by Google

The Soul at Death.

"Few ideas can be more absurd than the sleep of a soul. That it could sleep is an utter impossibility. Insensibility to it would be annihilation."—*Howels.*

Prayer in reference to Popery.

We beg to call the attention of our readers to the following proposal, and to entreat their compliance with it. We know not from whom the proposal has emanated; but that is of no consequence. Let us adopt it. *It is on their knees that Protestants are to fight and to prevail:*—

"It is therefore proposed that there should be a general concert for prayer for eight days, to begin on the morning of Thursday, the 15th day of April, 1852,—that some portion of the hours from seven to nine morning, and eight to ten evening, should be set apart for secret prayer,—that the topic for the day should be referred to in the family devotions,—that in every town and parish there should be, if possible, three public prayer-meetings (probably in different localities), say one on Thursday, the 15th, another on Sabbath, the 18th, and the third on Thursday, the 22d. And that fellowship societies should hold at least one meeting for the purpose of prayer at such a time as not to interfere with those of a more public nature.

"The following are proposed as subjects for prayer, each to occupy two days:—

"First (Thursday, 15th, and Friday, 16th April).—*The Total Destruction of the Papacy in Italy.*

"Under this head may be suggested as special topics for prayer,—That God would open a door for the distribution of Bibles throughout the whole of Italy, and bless his own Word, so that the masses may be prepared to shake off entirely the Papal yoke, as soon as they have it in their power;—that enlightened views may be spread as to the way in which the overthrow of the Papacy may be accomplished;—and for this purpose, that wisdom may be given to those exiled leaders who still have an opportunity of communicating with their countrymen;—and that, all things being ready, the Most High would hasten the crisis that is so greatly desired.

"Psalms (that may be sung at the public prayer-meetings or at family worship) xlv. 3—6; xciv. 1—6; cii. 12—15; cxliv. 4—8.

"Second (Saturday, 17th, and Sabbath, 18th).—*The deliverance of those who are immured in dungeons on account of their adherence to the principles of civil and religious liberty, and the restoration of those who, for the same reason, have been exiled from their native shores.*

"It has been calculated that 20,000 are incarcerated in the Roman States for the above reason, 25,000 in Naples, many in Austria, and several other places. It has been further calculated, that 30,000 have for the same reason been banished from Rome, or have had to flee from it. Multitudes from Hungary, from Naples, not a few from Florence and other towns where Popish influence is at work. Ardent prayer should ascend on behalf of all such; on behalf of the prisoners, that God would soon see it meet to relieve them from their bondage, and bless to them their severe trials; on behalf of the exiles, that they may meantime find favour with those among whom they have gone to sojourn,—that they may be more and more guided in the course they ought to pursue,—that they may become yet more acquainted with the principles of divine truth, and may all become truly converted to God, so that when it shall please Him to restore them to their respective native countries, they may be

Digitized by Google

instrumental in lighting up the darkness that has so long brooded over a large portion of Continental Europe. Among these two classes of sufferers may be included all who are subjected to annoyances and persecution for searching the Scriptures, and seeking to promote the spiritual welfare of those among whom their lot is cast. For a list of places where instances of such are to be found, see Section V., page 2, of this Appeal.

"Psalms ix. 18—20; lxxix. 11—13; xc. 13—17; cii. 16—21.

"THIRD (Monday, 19th, and Tuesday, 20th).—*The complete removal of that baneful influence which the Romish Priesthood exerts over the Government of Continental Europe. Specially, the annihilation of that odious system of Jesuitism, which has contributed so much to uphold those despotisms under which millions have so long been prostrated.*

"This topic needs no comment, except that all possible importunity in prayer should be employed for its accomplishment. The wrongs done to countless multitudes in past ages and at the present time,—the slaughtering of the saints,—the blood of the martyrs, as well as the prophetic denunciations of Holy Scripture, all summon to this great duty.

"Psalms lvi. 1—6; lvii. 2—5; lxiv. 5—10; lxxxiii. 1—4.

"FOURTH (Wednesday, 21st, and Thursday, 22d).—*Acknowledgment of Personal and National Sins, which have provoked God to permit the spread of Popery in the midst of us. Prayer for the Divine blessing upon those constitutional and Scriptural efforts that are used to oppose Popery, and to spread the light of Bible truth.*

"There should be great searchings of heart at such a time as the present in regard to individual transgressions, especially as to the little improvement which has been made of those distinguished privileges which have so long been enjoyed in this country. There should be deep humiliation on account of those public sins that dishonour God and disgrace the nation,—such as drunkenness, immorality, Sabbath-breaking, neglect of the ordinances of religion; want of vital godliness, and the countenance given to Popery. Supplications should be offered up on behalf of all the means adopted to reclaim those who have fallen a prey to vice, or who are deluded by the superstitions of the Papacy. No small efforts are at present being made to secure both these results; and from what has recently occurred in this country and Ireland, there is every reason to persevere in prayer for a thorough reformation from Popery, and all those evils that call for vengeance on this highly-favoured nation. Such alone can, under God, save this empire from her combined adversaries, and from merited judgments. And let prayer ascend for the same Spirit being poured upon other lands, that they may be led to return to God from their idols and vanities,—that there may be a complete overthrow of Romish priestcraft, wherever it may have gained a footing in the Old or New World,—that "all iniquity as ashamed may stop its mouth," and that truth and peace may dwell *in every nation, in every family, and in every heart.*

"Psalms lx. 1—5; lxxxv. 5—9; lxxix. 8, 9; cvi. 6—8."

Correspondence.

THE PROBABLE CREATION-PLACE OF ANGELS.

(*To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."*)

DEAR SIR,—I have just been reading the paper which appears in your Number for this month on "THE PROBABLE CREATION-PLACE OF ANGELS," and shall feel obliged if you will allow me to make a few brief remarks upon it.

Digitized by Google

With the view of the subject maintained by the writer of that paper, viz., that this earth had been inhabited by angels before it became the abode of man, I have long been familiar, as also with most of the arguments with which he attempts to support his opinion, but I have no desire to notice any other of them at present than those which are connected with the subject of Geology.

Referring to the discoveries of geologists respecting the antiquity of the earth, and to the fact that various races of animals have lived and died upon it before man was created, the writer observes (p. 108)—"the principle, so commonly received by Christians, that *as by sin came death into the world*, is at once disproved, inasmuch as, long before the creation of man upon the earth, death had reigned, and that to a vast extent."

I hope the writer of these words will pardon me if I say—this is a most objectionable statement; as are also those which appear on p. 110, where the geologist is represented as appealing to the same facts, "and then, with an air of triumph, pronouncing, That the doctrine is nought!" The geologist does nothing of the kind; he neither denounces "the doctrine," nor "the principle," —or should any one aspiring to the title be so rash as to do so, be it remembered that he finds no support for his rashness in the science itself. But the case stands really thus:—Between Geology and Scripture there is not the slightest disagreement in reference to the doctrine in question; but between Geology and the views of that doctrine held by some believers in Scripture there is the most fatal and irreconcileable difference. What the Scriptures say is this—"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all MEN, for that all have sinned." (Rom. v. 12.) Here, be it observed, all that is affirmed is this—by sin came the death of *man;* and to this statement *Geology makes not the slightest objection.* But some Christians are not satisfied to stop here, but they must forsooth make this *addition* to the record—*by sin came also the death of the lower animals. Now,* however, Geology interferes, and with the utmost confidence, indeed as with the voice of authority, denounces the addition as alike unwarrantable and false. Nor, I conceive, can it be denied that, in doing this, it may justly plead to be regarded as the humble defender of the perfection and all-sufficiency of Scripture, seeing that it may point to the place where it is written, "Ye shall not *add* unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it." (Deut. iv. 2.)

I have no wish to enter into any controversy, at present, respecting the question itself, as to whether this earth was the abode of angels previous to its becoming the habitat of man, and am quite willing it should be regarded as an open question; but I may be allowed to remark that, if it ever was the habitat of angels, *it affords no evidence of the fact*—not the slightest; so that, so far as *negative* evidence can be depended upon, we are justified, on *geological* grounds, in rejecting the opinion. *Man* will have left abundant traces of *his* presence here; but angels have left none of theirs.

I remain, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

Bushbury Vicarage, Jan. 30, 1852. A CHRISTIAN GEOLOGIST.

P.S.—Permit me to remark, in addition to what I have said above, that it is only among the fossils which belong to the period that immediately preceded that of man, that "*a larger proportion* of remains of gigantic dimensions are found, than among living tribes;" and hence that no argument can be drawn from Geology in favour of "the symmetry," which the writer whose paper I am commenting on supposes to have existed, between the animals that inhabited the earth in former days, and the angels "who excel in strength," seeing that for numerous periods, each of which was of immense duration, no such proportion prevailed.

Digitized by Google

OUR ONE LIFE.

"Occupy till I come."—LUKE xix. 13.

I.

'TIS not for man to trifle! Life is brief,
And sin is here.
Our age is but the falling of a leaf,
A dropping tear.
We have no time to sport away the hours,
All must be earnest in a world like ours.

II.

Not *many* lives, but only *one* have we,—
One, only one;—
How sacred should that one life ever be,—
That narrow span!—
Day after day filled up with blessed toil,
Hour after hour still bringing in new spoil.

III.

Our being is no shadow of thin air,
No vacant dream,
No fable of the things that never were,
But only seem.
'Tis full of meaning as of mystery,
Tho' strange and solemn may that meaning be.

IV.

Our sorrows are no phantom of the night,
No idle tale;
No cloud that floats along a sky of light,
On summer gale.
They are the true realities of earth,
Friends and companions even from our birth.

V.

O life below,—how brief, and poor, and sad!
One heavy sigh.
O life above,—how long, how fair, and glad;
An endless joy.
Oh, to be ever done with dying here;
Oh, to begin the living in yon sphere!

VI.

O day of time, how dark! O sky and earth,
How dull your hue;
O day of Christ,—how bright! O sky and earth,
Made fair and new!
Côme, better Eden, with thy fresher green;
Come, brighter Salem, gladden all the scene!

Some articles still stand over. Press of matter has prevented their insertion. We hope to overtake them in our next.

NOTICE.

All readers of the Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced; also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New Street, London.

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

JULY, 1852.

ART. I.—THE NEW HEAVENS AND THE NEW EARTH.

THE earliest intimation that the existing heavens and earth are destined to perish and to be changed appears to be given in Psalm cii. 25, 26; and we know from Heb. i. 10—12 that the Son of God, who originally created them, will be He who will "fold them up as a vesture," (περιβόλαιον, *wrapper*, or *outer garment*,) and change them. (Comp. Isaiah li. 6.)

Isaiah li. 16 may perhaps be an address of the Lord God to his servant Messiah, who is suddenly introduced speaking in chapter l. 4, and who seems equally abruptly addressed here as the true ISRAEL (chap. xlix. 1, &c.) in the midst of an exhortation to the Jewish people, and to whom the prophecy again returns in lii. 13, &c. If this interpretation be correct, Christ is here again represented as the destined creator of the new heavens and the new earth. "And I have put my words in thy mouth, and I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, to plant the heavens, and to lay the foundations of the earth, and to say unto Zion, Thou art my people."

In chap. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22, this new creation is again announced in the midst of predictions of the millennial felicity which will precede it; which circumstance has probably led to the error of some who have identified the period of the new heavens, &c., with the Millennium.* But the careful student of prophecy learns that events that seemingly synchronize in the prediction are sometimes separated, as to fact, by a wide interval. (See, *e.g.*, Isaiah ix. 6, 7; xxiii. 17, 18; Zech. xiii. 7—9.)

Just as the resurrection of the body will be the consumma-

* Though not entirely coinciding in this and in some other details with the following article, we give it as containing much that is scriptural.—EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

tion of redemption in the regenerate man, so the epoch of the new heavens, &c. will be the full development of the previous *palingenesia*, or regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory; and in speaking of this latter period nothing is more natural than that the still relatively future and more perfect one should occasionally be glanced at, as is the case in these passages of Isaiah. (Comp. Rom. viii. 30, where the element of time is disregarded in order that all the results of redemption may be brought together in one view.)

2 Pet. iii. speaks of scoffers in the last days, who would be as little impressed by the historical record of the flood as the men of Noah's days were by his prophecy of it. In *their* "stream of time" the catastrophe whereby "the world perished" has no place. In *their* annals of the world no such extraordinary interference with the even course of nature from "the beginning of the creation" is to be found. The circumstantial account by Moses, and the subsequent allusion to it by Eliphaz (Job xxii. 15—17), David (Ps. xxix. 10) "The Lord sat upon the flood לַמַּבּוּל,—word always used for Noah's flood,—yea, the Lord will sit king for ever;") Isaiah (liv. 9); our Lord (Matt. xxiv. 38, 39); Paul (Heb. xi. 7), and the apostle whose words we are referring to, are either not regarded at all or ingeniously explained in accordance with some Rationalistic theory. The difficulties that embarrass the believer, whether on the supposition that the deluge was universal or only partial, when he seeks for its traces on the earth and considers it in relation to human science,* are not

* It may be doubted whether the advocates of a partial deluge have sufficiently considered the following points of Scriptural evidence:—1. The intention of this judgment was to destroy every breathing thing,—animals, birds, and reptiles,—as well as the human race. (Gen. vi. 7, 17; vii. 4, 21—23.) Even supposing then that the latter had not extended at that time beyond a large district in Western Asia, is it not more than probable that the brute creation had spread far more widely over the earth?—and is the statement about the flood easily reconciled with the above-cited texts, that "the limits of its vengeance were the homes and haunts of the human family?" (Eadie's "Biblic. Cyclop.," art. "Flood") 2. Gen. viii. 22 intimates that the seasons and the alternations of day and night were interrupted. Does this accord with the theory of a merely local deluge? 3. From 2 Pet. iii. 5—7 it seems a natural inference that the past and the future catastrophes of the globe are co-extensive; and unless one questions the universality of the future one, the passage, it is submitted, does not fairly admit of a partial character being assigned to the past. The reader may, if he pleases, consult the art. "Deluge," in Dr. Kitto's "Cyclopædia of Bibl. Literature," for a view of the difficulties of this subject.

Digitized by Google

felt by these scoffers, who ignore the event altogether. But however wilfully ignorant of the past and blindly confident of the future they may be, the apostle declares that the present heavens and the earth shall be dissolved by fire in the day of the Lord—in the evening, we may say, of that "day of judgment" extending over one thousand years, in the early part of which the enemies of the Lord will be consumed (2 Thess. i. 7—9, &c., &c.), and the heavens and the earth be shaken. (Matt. xxiv. 29; Heb. xii. 26, &c.) In like manner as Enoch's prophecy overleaped the intervening judgment of the flood and dwelt on the (second) coming of the Lord, so Peter, passing by the second coming, dwells on the final period of that day, the whole of which we know will be occupied in the subjugation of the enemies of Christ. (1 Cor. xv. 25.)

This great final crisis is presented as a warning to the ungodly (2 Pet. iii. 7), and a motive for holy conversation (ver. 11), diligence (ver. 14), and ardent desire (ver. 12) to the Lord's servants, who should look for and hasten on (*i.e.*, earnestly expect and anticipate, comp. Jud. v. 28) the day of the dissolution of the present system of nature and the introduction of another, new, perfect, and everlasting.

Rev. xx. 11 relates to the same period; xxi. 1—5 describes the new heavens and the new earth, with the new Jerusalem which will come down to the new earth, when God will dwell with men, and "he that sitteth upon the throne will make *all things* new." That this is the Son may be inferred from this, that the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son. (John v. 22.) (Note the correct reading, Revel. xx. 12, is, "before *the throne*," not "before *God*.") It is clear also from Heb. i. 10—12. In the latter part of Rev. xxi. the relationship of the heavenly city to the *millennial* earth is described. During that period it will be (it appears) in the air, in sight of the earth, but not *upon* it. (Ver. 24.)

That there will be a relation between the new earth and the present one—in other words, that the former will not be the result of an independent act of creation—is more than probable, both from a consideration of 2 Pet. iii., and expressions elsewhere occurring. (Acts iii. 21; Rom. viii. 2; Matt. xix. 28.) And even apart from scriptural evidence, one would think it more for the glory of God that he should re-constitute and purify his creation than blot it out of existence.* The first of the above-mentioned passages speaks

* Our great sacred poet, no mean theologian, has several times

Digitized by Google

of "*times* of restitution of all things." There must then be at least *two* epochs in question, and as the first must be the millennium, the character of that which will succeed it must be *restitution* also. The second passage decidedly speaks of a final *deliverance* of the creation; and as to the third, the period of Christ's earthly reign, to which we know many features of imperfection will remain attached (Psalm cx. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26, &c.), would not, we may infer, have been called "*the regeneration*" unless an era still more blessed and freed from all blemish were destined to succeed it.

The great principle of the Divine counsels with respect to the recovery of fallen man is the bringing of life out of death. This mystery of death and resurrection may be traced throughout the ancient Scriptures, set forth in various typical facts and ordinances, as well as expressed in passages directly doctrinal. The following is probably far from being a complete list of the former class, and various of the passages cited may be considered perhaps inapposite by some; but it would be beside our present purpose to discuss them:—

Gen. i. 9—13; ii. 21; viii. 16—19; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21: xv. 12; xvii. 12; comp. Col. ii. 11—13: xxii., comp. Heb. xi. 19: Ex. ii. 10; xiv. 29; comp. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2: xxx. 1—8; comp. Titus iii. 5; Lev. viii. 6; Num. xvii. 8; Josh. iii. 16; Jud. xiv. 14; Isaiah i. 17. It may be remarked, in passing, that the argument of our Lord (Matt. xxii. 32) rests upon *life* being predicated in Scripture, properly and strictly only either of our present conditions, or of the resurrection state, and not of the condition of the departed. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead; but God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. *Therefore* the very propriety of his title as the God of Abraham, &c., depends on the future resurrection of the latter. Compare Hezekiah's words, Isaiah xxxviii. 18, 19. John, speaking of the first resurrection, says, "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded, &c. . . . . And *they lived* and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

If reasoning from analogy be permissible to a certain point, we might judge that the above principle of evolving life out of death would extend to the final destiny of the earth itself (which now affords illustration of it, 1 Cor. xv. 36—38), and not be limited to the persons of the redeemed. There is not the slightest evidence that *annihilation* enters into the

expressed the view of the production of the new heavens and earth from the conflagration of the former. (See "Par. Lost," book iii., 333, &c.; xi., end; xii., 547, &c.

Digitized by Google

Divine plans with respect to any part of creation, and we can conceive of no other alternative. The antediluvian world "perished," and yet it re-appeared on the subsiding of the waters. The earth that is now will also perish (Psalm cii. 26), but, concluding from the past, only that its elements having been dissolved, may be re-modelled in unparalleled and everlasting beauty.

The earliest type of resurrection (and perhaps not without significancy in reference to the future destiny of our globe) is presented in the work of the third day of creation, when the waters that had previously covered the pre-adamite world were gathered together into one place, and the dry land appeared. Nor is this the only way in which the type appears. The provision made for the propagation of herbs and fruits by the seeds of each is suggestive of the same mystery. (1 Cor. xv. 36—38.) Moreover, the *third* day is itself significant, and of its works it is twice recorded, "and God saw that it was good." Ps. civ. 6—9 (comp. Job xxxviii. 8—11; Prov. viii. 25—29) evidently relates to the same period. Indeed the whole Psalm is a celebration of the works of creation narrated in Gen. i. The close of it seems prophetic of a bright future, when that which was originally pronounced "very good" should more than recover its pristine excellence, and physical as well as moral evil be entirely removed from it. "The glory of the Lord shall endure for ever; the Lord shall rejoice in his works." "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more." (Vers. 31, 35.)

This era of universal restoration, "the dispensation of the fulness of times," in which all things shall be gathered together in one in Christ, both which are in the heavens and which are in the earth (Ephes. i. 10), the ordinance of the Jubilee (Lev. xxv.) seems to foreshadow. The trumpet of the Jubilee was sounded on the day of atonement in the fiftieth year; liberty was proclaimed throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof; every man returned unto his possession and unto his family. There was no sowing, nor reaping, nor gathering of grapes, but as in the other Sabbatical years so in this grand one, "*the Sabbath of the land*" was meat for master, servant, maid, hired servant, the stranger, the cattle, and the beast of the field. *All* living creatures partook of the spontaneous products of the land. An institution which, it has been truly remarked, "viewed in all its bearings . . . . . . is wholly unparalleled by any event in the

Digitized by Google

history of the world." * And how plainly it indicates a future rest or Sabbatism (Heb. iv. 9) to the people of God on the basis of atonement. Nay, it seems also to point to such a rest as the earth itself, and every breathing thing upon it, as well as man, will share in. The joyous and prolonged blast of the silver trumpet resounding on the hills and in the plains of the land of Israel may prefigure the whole creation's final deliverance from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God.

One exception only was there to the universal restitution of alienated property in the year of Jubilee; that of houses built in walled towns. Whether rightly deducible or not from this typical feature, it is certain that the artificial works of man will not share in the general restitution of the creation of God. Redemption will not extend to the achievements of science and the monuments of art that are associated with the history of a fallen race. Even those trophies of human skill that may escape the destruction with which many will be visited in the beginning of the day of the Lord (Isaiah ii. 15—17) cannot survive the general dissolution at its close.

The Sabbaths are said to be a shadow of things to come. (Col. ii. 16, 17.) The Sabbath-day, with its rest for man and beast, and the Sabbath-year, or "year of release" (Lev. xxv.; Deut. xv.), when the *land* also had rest and debtors were forgiven, both appear to point to the millennium, the first of the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, the first likewise, as already observed, of "the times of restitution of all things." But the larger cycle of seven Sabbaths of years would appear, as above noticed, to have a wider typical scope, and to point onwards to the ultimate and complete triumph of redemption. We are not obliged, however, to limit its reference to this great consummation and overlook its previous bearings. Isaiah lxi., comp. Luke iv. 18—21, shows that this present age is the acceptable year of the Lord in respect of the manifestation of his grace to sinners. And a yet more literal and complete fulfilment of the whole chapter will be seen when Israel shall be converted and restored to their land, and "the day of vengeance of our Lord" shall have overtaken their enemies. Lastly, the eternal period will be, as it were, a final blast from the Creator's jubilee trumpet, when He that established the ordinance in Israel,—that as the reputed son of Joseph, expounded the sixty-first of Isaiah in the synagogue at

* Kitto's "Cycl.," art. "Jubilee."

Digitized by Google

Nazareth,—that will soon return to reign over his ancient people and the whole world,—shall sit on the great white throne and say, "Behold, I make all things new."

May we, without being deemed fanciful, place in connexion with the destiny of the earth the ordinance in Num. xxxi. 23? Such of the spoils taken from the enemy that could "abide the fire" were to be made to go through the fire in order to be cleansed, and all others were to be made to go through the water. Now, the earth having fallen into Satan's power has already been "overflowed with water," and when the time shall arrive that, consistently with the Divine purposes, it can abide the fire, it will be purified by that means also, and brought into such a state of perfectness, that in the most absolute and unqualified sense, it is said of it, "wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Pet. iii. 13.)

It is probable that the promise to Abraham (Gen. xii. 3) contemplated this final result, as well as the anterior blessings of mankind under the reign of Christ, and that the patriarch looked forward to the time when the foundations of the heavenly city should actually rest on the earth (Heb. xi. 10), presenting a most marked contrast to the shifting tabernacles without foundations in which, with the heirs with him of the same promise, he dwelled during his pilgrim life.

Of the nature of the future renovated earth we have scarcely any particulars given. But the one remarkable exception to the silence of Scripture that there will be "no more sea," may rather lead to the inference that there will be some general resemblance in *other* details to the constitution of the old. The mention of this (apparently) *leading* feature of difference suggests a certain degree of parallelism and correspondency as obtaining in other respects. May not the new earth bear as strong a resemblance to the preceding as our resurrection bodies will bear to our present ones? To this idea we might apply the words which Milton puts in the mouth of Raphael:—

> ———— "What if earth
> Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein
> Each to other like, more than on earth is thought?"
>
> *Paradise Lost*, v.

It may be inquired, To what extent are we to expect a change of "the heavens?" Now we are not obliged by Scripture to suppose that the creation of all the heavenly bodies was coeval with that epoch when our globe was in six days brought into its actual state.

The Mosaic account, as has been often pointed out, whilst,

Digitized by Google

with no scientific scope, describing what may be termed the *relative* creation, that is, adaptation, of the sun, moon, and stars, to earthly purposes, (the only way, indeed, in which we can conceive of the *genesis* being at all made intelligible to the mass of mankind,) is yet reconcilable with all the reasonable postulates of modern science. And when, for instance, with the aid of the astonishing space-penetrating power of some modern telescopes, some far-distant nebula appears as a dim film in the field of view, the light of which must have been millions of years travelling to us, the pious astronomer does not find the inspired narrative at variance with the tidings thus conveyed to him from such inconceivably remote regions of space.

The testimony of the works of God is increasingly found to be in perfect harmony with the testimony of his Word. Again, we are not told in Scripture that more worlds have fallen than our own; or supposing that they have, whether few or many. Nor could we say in what ways, or at what times, such supposed fallen worlds would be dealt with by the Creator.

It would appear from the above considerations that the *astral* heavens are not intended to be involved in the dissolution of the earth. And to this conclusion the examination of 2 Pet. iii., where alone any details respecting this question are to be found, likewise leads. The heavens and the earth which were of old (ver. 5), it is implied, were *both* involved in the catastrophe of the deluge, for they are immediately contrasted with "*the heavens and the earth which are now,*" and which are reserved unto fire. The world (*κόσμος*) then, which perished at the flood, includes the atmospheric heavens; as Calvin expresses it: "Heaven also was then drowned," that is, the "region of the air, which is spread out empty between the two waters. For that distinction which Moses speaks of (Gen. i. 6) was destroyed." The starry firmament was certainly not affected at that time, and the same aërial regions that *did* share in that destruction must be those which hereafter "shall pass away with a great noise," and "being on fire, shall be dissolved." "Of the elements of the world," says the eminent commentator just quoted, "I will say this one word, that they will be consumed only to acquire a new nature, while the substance remains, as may be easily gathered from Rom. viii. 21, and other places." These views are also advocated by Augustine, "City of God," book xx.

From this final period must be carefully distinguished the

Digitized by Google

shaking of the heavens and the earth, and those celestial signs which will be the accompaniments of the second advent of our Lord at the commencement of his kingdom. (Hag. ii. 21; Isa. xiii. 10, xxiv. 18—20, xxxiv. 4; Matt. xxiv. 29; Rev. vi. 12—14, &c.) In what sense are we to understand that at that time the stars shall fall from heaven to the earth? The arbitrary canon, by which this and similar things are explained of the fall of dynasties, potentates, &c. (see Lowth and others,) we need not now stop to examine. And it seems alike opposed to scriptural and philosophical evidence to receive the statement literally. In Ps. viii. the heavens, the moon, and stars, are objects of adoration to the spectator in the millennium. (Compare Ps. cxlviii. 3.) In Jer. xxxi. 35, 36, the perpetuity of the seed of Israel is declared by the Lord to be as the permanency of the ordinances of the sun, moon, and stars. So in Ps. lxxii. 5, 7, 17, lxxxix. 29, 36, 37, the throne of Messiah is pronounced to be co-eternal with the heavenly bodies. In Ps. cxlviii. 6, it is said of the latter, "He hath also established them for ever and ever (לָעַד לְעוֹלָם), he hath made a decree which shall not pass;" in like manner as in Ps. civ. 5, it is said of the earth, "Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed for ever and ever (עוֹלָם וָעֶד)." Such passages at least show that the stars continue during the millennium, and therefore will not literally fall from heaven at its commencement. In Joel iii. 15, it is merely said, they "will withdraw their shining." Their *falling*, therefore, will be merely *optical*, or apparent, as the *sun* and *moon* are said to have *stood still* at the bidding of Joshua; and as the miracle performed for Hezekiah, when the sun "returned ten degrees," may have been produced either by an extraordinary deflection of the rays of the sun, or a change in the motion of the earth; the latter supposition, however, is the less probable, inasmuch as the wonder seems to have been only local;—it was "done in *the land*." (2 Chron. xxxii. 31.)

We know that the Lord will arise to *shake terribly* the earth (Isa. ii. 21); its *foundations will shake*, it will be *moved exceedingly; reel like a drunkard*, be *moved to and fro like a hammock*. (Isa. xxiv. 18—20.) Such violent concussions would probably produce the appearance as of the stars falling. Others may prefer the hypothesis of showers of aërolites, or "falling stars."

To this, however, seems opposed the statement, "the powers of the heavens shall be shaken," by which is probably

Digitized by Google

intended the heavenly bodies, (the expression often occurs in this sense in the Septuagint, *e.g.*, Isa. xxxiv. 4,) those which rule the day and night, which (probably only *in appearance*) will be tossed to and fro.

It is striking to observe how constantly the brute creation has hitherto been associated both with the blessings and punishments of its human head. In the primeval world,—in the fall,—in the flood,—in Noah's covenant,—in the plagues of Egypt,—in the preservation of Israel in Egypt (Exod. xi. 7),—in the hallowing of the first-born,—in the Sabbath rest,—in the judgment upon a city that should lapse into idolatry (Deut. xiii. 15),—in the judgment on Achan,—on the Benjamites (Judges xx. 48,)—on Jerusalem, by the Chaldeans (Jer. xxi. 6),—in the grant to Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xxvii. 6; Dan. ii. 38),—in the doom of Babylon (Jer. li. 62),—of Edom (Ezek. xxv. 18),—of Egypt (Ezek. xxix. 8),—in the mercy shown to Nineveh (Jonah iv. 11),—in the future judgment on the enemies of Jerusalem (Zech. xiv. 15),—in these and other instances we perceive how uniformly the lower sentient creation has partaken of the destiny of man, whether in general, or in particular cases; how it has been included in the Lord's past grand dispensational arrangements of the world, from Adam to the times of the Gentiles, commencing with Nebuchadnezzar, and still continuing. And the prophetic page clearly intimates its participation in the blessings of the reign of Christ. For the idea, that after all this it would not have a place in the ultimate perfection of all things no valid reason can be adduced.

On this point it may be interesting to some to peruse the following extract:—

In *Tertullian against Hermogenes*, we read:—"Then will there be an end of death, when the devil who presides over it shall have departed into the fire that God has prepared for him,—when the revelation of the sons of God shall have redeemed the creation from evil, everywhere subject to vanity; when the innocence and perfectness of the creation being restored, the cattle shall be in harmony with the wild beasts, and little children shall play with serpents, when the Father shall have placed under the feet of the Son his enemies," &c. "The last part of this extract," observes Poole (Synopsis), "agrees with the opinion of the Rabbins, who believe that even dumb animals will obtain a better state when men shall rise." (See Manassem, on the "Resurrection.")

Tertullian here evidently confounds the circumstances of

Digitized by Google

the millennial epoch with those of the period following it. But his opinion is clear relative to the restoration and perpetuity of the entire animal creation.

In *Matthew Henry's Exposition of the New Testament*, we read (on Rom. viii. 19—22)—" There shall be a glory conferred upon all the creatures which shall be (in the proportion of their nature), as suitable and as great in advancement as the glory of the children of God shall be to them. The fire at the last day shall be a refining, not a destroying, annihilating fire. What becomes of the souls of brutes, that go downwards, none can tell. But it should seem by the Scriptures that there will be some kind of restoration of them. And if it be objected, what use will they be to glorified saints? we may suppose them of as much use as they were to Adam in innocency; and if it be only to illustrate the wisdom, power, and goodness of their Creator, that is enough."

In "*The Religion of Geology, and its connected Sciences,*" *by Edward Hitchcock, D.D.*, (pp. 81, 82,) we read—" Whether the inferior animals will exist again after death is a more doubtful point. There is certainly nothing in Scripture decisive against their future existence; for the passage in the Psalms which says, that man that is in 'honour and abideth not is like the brutes that perish,' if understood to mean the annihilation of animals, would prove also the annihilation of wicked men. And while most men of learning and piety have suspended their opinion on the existence of the inferior animals after death, for want of evidence, some have been decided advocates of the future happy existence of all beings who exhibit a spark of intelligence. Not a few distinguished German theologians and philosophers regard the whole visible creation, both animate and inanimate, as at present in a confined and depressed state, and struggling for freedom. On this principle Tholuck explains that most difficult passage in Romans, which declares that 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.' He supposes this 'bound or fettered state of nature,' both animate and inanimate, to have a casual connexion with sin, and the death accompanying it among men; and, therefore, when men are freed from sin and death, 'the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.' The kingdom of God, according to Tholuck, Martin Luther, and many other distinguished theologians, will not be transferred to heaven at the end of the world, but be established on earth, where all these transformations of the animate and inanimate

Digitized by Google

creation will take place. This exposition surely carries with it a great deal of naturalness and probability; and if it be true, death to the inferior animals must surely be an indication of great benevolence on the part of the Deity, since it introduces them to a higher state of existence."

The following extracts from the same interesting work, exhibit the opinions of the pious and learned writer on the obscure subject of death in the pre-Adamite epochs of our globe:—"I maintain that God, in the beginning, adapted every other being and event in the world to man's character and condition, so that there should be entire harmony in its system. And since, either in the Divine appointment, or in the nature of things, there is an inseparable connexion between sin and death, the latter must constitute a feature of the system of the world, because a free agent would introduce the former. Death would ultimately exist in the world, and, therefore, all creatures placed in such a world must be made mortal, at whatever period created. . . . . Death, therefore, entered into the original plan of the world in the Divine mind, and was endured by the animals and plants that lived anterior to man. Yet, as the constitution of the world is doubtless very different from what it would have been if sin had not existed in it, and as man alone was capable of sin, it is proper to regard man's transgression as the occasion of all the suffering and death that existed on the globe since its creation. . . . . . The certainty of man's apostasy might have been the grand reason in the Divine mind for giving to the world its present constitution, and subjecting animals to death. Not that God altered his plan upon a prospective knowledge that man would sin; but He made this plan originally, that is, from eternity, with that event in view; and he made it different from what it would have been if such an event had not been certain. If this be true, then was there a connexion between man's sin and the death that reigned before his existence; though, in strict accuracy of speech, one can hardly be called the cause of the other." (Pp. 96, 97.)

This theory, however, while it removes some difficulties, seems impossible to be reconciled with certain parts of the narrative in Genesis. It is difficult in the extreme to conceive that disease, death, and corruption, should have originally been connected with the creatures that were pronounced by their Maker, "Good;" that animals should have preyed upon one another, when God had assigned to *every* beast, fowl, and reptile, every green herb for food; that fierce and ravenous species should have prowled about

Digitized by Google

(if not *in*) the garden planted in Eden. For if any were then carnivorous they must have displayed the same passions as now; from the effects of which, if we suppose Adam himself to have been preserved by a special arrangement of God, we should thus transfer to his paradisaical state, a feature of a later and inferior one. (Gen. ix. 2.) It may be remarked, too, that even if such passages as Isa. xi. 6—9, and lxv. 25, be understood as figurative, we can scarcely doubt that the figure was derived from the *fact* that animals now noxious were once harmless. But on the hypothesis of Professor Hitchcock, how is the *curse* upon the beasts and the earth explained? For one cannot see what room there was for the infliction of any fresh penalty, if everything had previously been accommodated to the circumstances of fallen man, and framed in mournful harmony with his far-seen ruined condition. Nor, as *curse* presupposes a state of *blessing*, would the difficulty be met by antedating ever so much the commencement of the reign of death over animals. Into "the original plan" the *curse* could not enter; nor, therefore, death; unless the two be either altogether different or separate things.

Another writer, (Dr. Harris,—"The Pre-Adamite Earth,") tells us that the sustainment of animal life or vegetable food alone, would not only unconsciously diminish the amount of animal life and enjoyment, but still leave death in the animal world from a thousand accidents. "The foot of the ox," he says, "would crush the insects in the grass; the breeze waft them by myriads into the stream; and the evaporation and exhaustion of the lake leave the fish dead on the shore." That such liabilities, however, really existed in the beginning, who is to assure us? Here again the poetry of Milton is no less beautiful than are his sentiments consonant with the impressions derived from Scripture. The reader will remember the descriptions of the effects of sin on all nature:—

> "Earth felt the wound, and nature from her seat,
> Sighing thro' all her works gave signs of woe
> That all was lost."

"Par. Lost," ix. 783, &c.; x. 640—610, 652—715; xi. 182—192.*

* The following remarks on the chrysalis are from an able pamphlet on "*Immortality: its real and alleged Evidences,*" *by J. T. Gray,* (Jackson and Walford):—"In the insect transformation (of the chrysalis) we see clearly that under an apparent disorganization of frame *the germ of*

Art. II.—IS ROME THE BABYLON OF THE APOCALYPSE?

Part III.

When Dioclesian, elected by the army as Emperor, and by the Senate as Pontiff, ascended the Capitol, and declared himself the Viceroy of God upon earth, all things betokened the approach of some fearful catastrophe. Men's minds were perturbed by presages of thick coming danger. Hitherto the wars of Rome, dictated by necessity, had for long been limited to wars of reprisal against aggressive barbarians, and she, therefore, biding her time, had avoided engaging at the same moment in different contests beyond her own frontiers. Thus her entire might could be brought to bear on any point of danger, and the legionary quartered at Caerleon might, equally with the Pretorian Cohorts at Rome, or the long battalions that lined the Tigris, be ordered at any moment to march upon Jerusalem, or concentrate at Vienna. Thus, too, each enemy attacked in turn, had yielded to her ponderous force. The times, however, had changed. The system of taxation and of exclusively paid military service, introduced by Augustus, and carried into effect "when Cyrenius was made Governor of Syria," had now worked its destined results. Apparently just, it was of all measures most fatal. By it the uncontrolled will of the Emperor decided the expenses of the Empire, and his ministers had only to apportion those expenses amongst the different communities according to their reported wealth *at the last census;* leaving each community to raise the money at which it was assessed how it pleased, by its own elected representatives. Hence arose three great evils: first, that every man endeavouring to underrate his wealth, the most unscrupulous escaped the most lightly; secondly, that in every community where a difference of opinion or party existed the minority were taxed at discretion of the majority, and thus the weight was thrown upon shoulders least able to bear it; and thirdly, that as the tax was levied upon long-past estimates of the wealth

existence may be yet preserved; that an entire suspension of animation is not identical with its extinction; and that a change, which to the eye may be unpleasing and even loathsome, *may yet be the natural process of transition to a higher state of being.* Is it improbable that the very *design* of such transformation was a lesson of hope to us? . . . . At all events, we must (to use no harsher epithet,) be incurably dull, if we cannot read in such facts the *possibility* of our own resurrection and immortality."—P. 39.

Digitized by Google

of each community,—a community, which had fallen off to few members, paid the same as when numerous, whilst one which had trebled its wealth and population paid no more. In other words, according to this *admirable* system Liverpool and Glasgow would pay less than Old Sarum or Caerleon. The result of this was to destroy the agricultural population of the less fertile districts, since wherever they temporarily suffered by wars or pestilence the pressure of taxation became too great for the survivors to endure, and the arrears of taxes always continuing chargeable on the land the rural districts soon became deserted. Nor was this all. It led to a universal system of bribing the tax assessors and the officers of each census.

It is easy to see how this must have acted on Christianity. No Christian villager could live under the hostility of the elders of his district, all of whom were members of the mysteries. He was thus forced to seek shelter in the towns, where numbers might afford mutual protection. But even here a combination for mutual support was necessarily a secret one. The great object of the Christians was, as now in Turkey, to become *licensed* communities. This appears to have been tacitly allowed under Alexander Severus. But, then, who was to fix the amount each individual should bear of his congregational assessment? Who so fit as his pastor? But to assess fairly it became necessary that this pastor should be at liberty to inquire into everything. Thus a modified confessional was introduced, and thus the Episcopus became a civil officer. His post was a perilous one, for, if the tribute were not made up, he was the hostage and the martyr. Hence it was also an honourable and influential one. He became the Treasurer of the Church. But it was essential that the Treasurer of the Church should have no temptation to spend its treasures on his own family. Hence the desire to have for bishops strangers and unmarried men. As head of the congregation the Episcopus had to stand between it and Roman exactions. Thus the talents of the rhetorician and the lawyer were called into play, and thus the whole character of the office was changed. The extreme Anti-State Church man who maintains that the chief pastors of the Church did not at a very early period assume civil powers, and the High Episcopalian who asserts that they did so by direction of the apostles, appear to us alike grievously to err. The real truth is, that circumstances may have forced good men to perform these duties for the protection of their people, but that when these duties ceased

Digitized by Google

to be dangerous, and became profitable, they were eagerly claimed by unconverted and ambitious men as rights annexed inseparably to their office. Hence, however, a fresh impulse was given to the confessional. Thence again the inclination for an unmarried clergy was rapidly increased amongst the people, who dreaded lest their funds should be employed by the bishops to aggrandize their own families. Now we must also observe that the Church being a growing community there was every inducement for the Basilidians to join its ranks, as by so doing they diminished very considerably the amount of their income-tax. Thus, the bishops again, anxious to relieve their flocks, received everybody who came as outer-court worshippers, and thus the jealousies must have increased between them and the diminishing bodies of Isis-worshippers and pure Gnostics, who felt that every convert, real or apparent, to Christianity, left his burden to be borne by those who remained faithful to the mysteries.

Such is the state of the Greek Empire still, and to this system may be attributed the moral paralysis under which it now labours. To this rather than to the Turkish tyranny she owes her fall. To it the Sultan may ascribe his moral impotence.

The result of these measures had been the escheat of unoccupied estates to Government, and their conversion into Imperial domains or re-grant to Imperial favourites, who cultivated them by slave labour. This of course had destroyed the agricultural class. In the great towns again the people were rigidly disarmed and excluded from military exercises. Thus it had become impossible to raise a native army, and the Emperors were compelled to recruit their forces either from the mountain tribes, who owned a doubtful and uncertain allegiance, or with Gauls, Britons, Germans, Sclavonians, and Moors, who were interchanged so as to watch opposite races, but who had no sympathies with the Greek or Roman people, and could rarely converse in their tongues.

At this period, however, the tide of war seemed to set in on four different frontiers at the same time. The rising of the coast of Siberia had turned the course of the rivers that run into Lake Aral, and compelled millions of mounted inhabitants to seek elsewhere water for their flocks and food for themselves. These men, however, were of two kinds, the Tartar, a race apparently half Japhetic, half Hamitic, distinguished by the ferocity of its passions, the strength of its will, its iron hardihood, and the Gothic or

Digitized by Google

Scandinavian tribes, who had retired northwards under Odin, before the arms of Lucullus. These mounted warriors coasting round the Black Sea poured down into Germany, driving before them the less warlike inhabitants headlong upon the Roman lines, whilst the most warlike of all sought the coasts of the Baltic and the mountains of Scandinavia. To meet them required the whole power of Rome, and the Emperor was called therefore to head his own Dalmatian and Albanian countrymen on the Dacian frontier.

But this very movement gave confidence to other enemies. The regulars in their immediate front reduced in number, the Persians, the Moors, the Saxons, all renewed their attacks against an unarmed people, and it was soon found that to contend against opponents so different, required different systems, different tactics, and different arms. We have ourselves seen how little the square formations and bright bayonets that triumphed at Waterloo and Aliwal have done against the naked Kaffir, and as little would the appointments and manœuvres for Kaffir war avail against the Frenchman's cannon or the Seik's scimitar. Hence it became necessary to have four distinct armies, each having its own separate staff and Commander-in-chief, or in other words, *Imperator*, and its own peculiar organization and system of recruitment. Thus also Galerius, having no longer the north to draw upon for his soldiery, must have recruited with Koordish mountaineers, the only men in his dominions fit for war, but who have always, true to their old demon worship, manifested a deadly hatred to the name of Christ.

The time for a complete change in the administration of the Roman and Greek Empires had therefore now arrived. Hitherto the military command of the whole jointly with the Pontificate of the West had been vested in one Emperor, but the civil administration had been carried on by the four distinct Viceroys, with their respective Cabinets. Now, it became necessary that each province should have its own military centre, and its own army, adapted to the peculiar duties it was required to perform. The necessity was complied with, and the Roman Empire now had *four* heads, Dioclesian, Galerius, Maximin, and Constantius, all—pardon the expression—connected by the Pontificate of Dioclesian, as by a great spinal process, with the Senate and people of Rome.

No sooner had this been carried through than the religious state of the Empire required attention. A mere military chief might sanction unlimited toleration, since his will was

Digitized by Google

law, and he could enforce it at any moment, but the only means by which three co-equal Emperors could be kept in union with the fourth was by the national religion. Dioclesian as Pontiff was their master and their priest. He alone was *sacred and inviolable*. He had the veto on all laws, for he alone could offer the sacrifices at which was pronounced the will of the Supreme. On him depended the awful fiat of the gods. Thus, he now had a direct interest in maintaining the old Roman creed, and in compelling all to worship the old Roman deities. Here too his natural character must be considered. He was by blood what ethnologists call a Schypetar, an individual of the same race as Mehemet Ali, Ali Pasha, Scanderbeg, and others, a race singularly indifferent to all religions except as means to an end, and who with great energy, considerable talent, and much valour, are mainly remarkable for intense selfishness, indifference to other men's suffering, and indomitable will. They have always been marked as chiefs without chivalry, merchants without munificence, and mountaineers without patriotism. Hence this man was quite ready to tolerate or to destroy the Church as it suited him best.

Now, at this very time Egypt, for long divided between the Moudeman worshippers of Isis, the Christians, and the Hamitic followers of Serapis, or the male principle, and a multitude who mixed up all three creeds without understanding any, was literally scourged into rebellion by excessive demands for support of the slaves and sycophants of Rome. Very sternly was their rebellion suppressed. In it the worshippers of Isis had led the way. Dioclesian murdered their priests, destroyed their writings, annihilated their sacred literature, and appears to have left them no refuge for escape except amongst the Vitrian monks of the desert. Here, then, was another front of contact between Isis worship and Christianity. Can we believe that these skilful mesmerists and magicians of the Memphitic temples would not work on the minds of ignorant and weak-minded ascetics, excited by fasting into mental delirium, and on the look out for miracles. However this may be, the necessity of suppressing the Egyptian revolt placed Dioclesian's Government in exact opposition to the worshippers of Isis everywhere. The secret mysteries of Cybele, of which Dioclesian was chief, do not appear to come under the same ban of the Pontiff.

But there was another faith spreading,—a faith more natural, yet more dangerous in a country inhabited only by the very rich and the very poor. It was neither more nor

Digitized by Google

less than modern Socialism in its foulest shape. It had first taken its rise in Persia. The followers of Basilides, driven across the Tigris, appear to have carried out their universal custom, to combine the popular creed with their own. In Persia they found a vast Semitic population, who had been conquered but not enslaved by the tribes of the North.

The state of this population was entirely antagonistic to that of Rome. Its first layer, we have already observed, consisted, towards the west, of the conquered descendants of Cush, who still clung to their old worship of the Power of Evil, and most of whom appear afterwards to have fled to India. To the south, of the children of Arphaxad, the modern Persians, who, we know for the most part are practical Boodists, assuming the name of Moslems, but in truth doubting all things, and thoroughly Pantheists. Both these were ruled by the mailed votaries of Mithra the war-god. Now, the conquerors, aware how much the intellect of men depends on their mothers, and that the effect of an intermarriage with a different type of mankind remains in the family for at least ten generations, constituted themselves as much an aristocracy of race as the American planters now, or as the French aristocracy did up to 1789. They allowed the conquered to form guilds and municipalities, to hold all civil offices, to grow as rich as they pleased; even to organize their own militia; but they excluded them from regular military command; and the poorest Circassian then, as now, looked with intense contempt on the richest merchant. On the other hand, the Government seems to have been tolerably equitable, far more so than the Roman, and the country flourished. Yet the merchant revelling in wealth, naturally envied the haughty bearing and lordly look of the ruling caste, as they passed him bristling with arms, whilst the poor and perhaps dissolute members of the aristocracy scowled on the wealthy merchant, and longed to share his wealth.

Now, the Basilidian movement tended to unite all these discordant elements, just as Jesuitism in its last form of Jacobinism united all the powers of evil in 1793. To the impoverished aristocrat it preached that his deity Mithra had united himself to the man Jesus Christ, to declare the abolition of individual property, and of marriage. To the Chaldee it allowed that Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews and of the true Church, was a stern God, and a jealous, and the foe of the true Supreme. To the wealthy Sooffee it spoke of the natural equality of man, and told him that he had the same right to office with the Arab or Circassian. Its

Digitized by Google

lodges spread and multiplied. They became diffused through Persia; Mazdak their prophet pretended to be the apostle of God. The Chaldees seem at first to have merged into them. Their magical powers were exerted. The King himself was deceived. Socialism triumphed. A decree was issued abolishing marriage, and destroying all difference between legitimate and illegitimate children, thus rendering impossible the continuance of an aristocracy. The declaration that all property belonged to the State appeared to destroy its very existence. But the King forgot that the war caste still retained their sabres, their horses, and their coats of mail, their skill in arms, and their pride of blood. A fierce reaction followed and a bloody war, in which a hundred thousand prisoners were executed at a time. Discipline at length prevailed. The surviving Socialists, driven across the Tigris, sought shelter under the banners of Rome. They were received at first gladly, as foes to Persia. Their views, however, began to spread. Alarm seized the Emperor. What if the vast *slave* population should once hear the doctrine and become Manichæans too? What if these dogmas should become diffused amongst the under-paid soldiery of the legions? Rome had no military aristocracy, no warlike gentlemen on whom to fall back, no point on which the lovers of order might rally. Its large towns contained more slaves than freemen, and of the freemen thousands were paupers. It became necessary to suppress, at whatever cost, the new ideas.

What course then could Galerius, whose portion of the Empire was mostly affected by the new doctrine, adopt under the circumstances? Unhappily he had refused the means of grace, he had neglected the one name by which men can be saved. He sought his priests for instruction, the priests of Cybele. He called in his colleagues. They felt their danger. They felt all the hereditary hatred of the worshippers of the male principle as opposed to their own secret worship of the female. They said that Manichæanism must be crushed, or it would crush them. But they also saw that Christianity was the message of Jehovah, and that unless Christianity was exterminated Satan their Deity could not reign. And they led their dupes forward, and the fearful oblations were made, and that mysterious incense (still used in the rites of the Illuminati) consumed, and the sacrifices offered of living men; and as the trembling tyrants stood between the reeking limbs of virgins hewn into quarters, and yet palpitating with life, they believed that they saw the

Digitized by Google

infernal gods visibly appear, offer them direction, and promise them aid, and they devoted themselves to the service of the Dark King of the infernal gods.

The decree went forth forbidding *Manichæanism.* The decree excited small surprise. It secured the support of the friends of order everywhere, even of the worshippers of the Goddess and of the old Roman Aristocracy. Under this decree lurked a secret object unknown to the multitude. All were deemed Manichees who recognised Christ, in any form, as the messenger of God. The bishops were carried off suddenly to the mines, the pastors scourged or crucified, the Bible everywhere burned, all religious worships save those of Jupiter and Cybele in the Roman Empire, Zeus and Athena in the Greek, Serapis in Egypt, and in Thrace the deadly delusions of the demon War Gód. Had the decree named the Christians especially, some obscure sects might have escaped; but here, all were confounded under one ordinary name, all were represented as alike evil, all were alike suppressed as Socialists, and the character, the finances, the endowments, and in many cases the private property of all was confiscated to the State. The Roman finances were recruited, but who can tell how deep a blow was struck at the very existence of the Empire? From this time Isis worship and that of Cybele alone remained as secret creeds, and could alone hold conventicles. Basilidianism, therefore, had the opportunity of unchecked progress.

For ten years no Christian teaching could be obtained in public. It could only be in secret and small lodges that parties, with carefully closed doors, could hear aught of Christ. But this, to the Basilidian, was easy and safe. Arrested by the officers of justice, he had but to give the countersign, and they knew him for the initiated, and willingly received his word that he was but teaching the legalized creeds. All writers admit that it was in secret lodges, and thus only, for ten years at least, Christianity was carried on, and all readers must perceive that long before the close of that time Basilidians and Christians must, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, have been crushed into one outwardly indistinguishable mass, the same individual assuming opposite characters with different conventicles.

We may, however, satisfy ourselves that the number of real Christians existing at this period can have been at the commencement of the struggle but small, or their martyrdom or exile would have disorganized society. Were an edict to go forth in England, Scotland, or America, condemning every

Digitized by Google

Christian pastor to be scourged and crucified, and every layman, who confessed that Christ was other than a malefactor, to be deprived of civil rights and conveyed to the hulks for life, all business would be paralyzed, and we doubt whether the order could be enforced by any conceivable number of armed men. On the contrary, it appears that no moral resistance was offered to the Imperial command; that the emperors, on the other hand, grew in popularity by what the world called their wise and prudent measures; and that Dioclesian, in particular, was regarded by the people as a great and majestic prince, the restorer of the Roman Empire, and another Trajan. No one struggled, no one resisted; latterly, none even clamoured; and at the time Dioclesian resigned his imperial pontificate, Christianity was to be traced only in the mines or at the galleys, and the songs of praise that had been wont to rise to the Saviour had now everywhere ceased. Never had the Roman and Greek races appeared so united in establishing the supremacy of their ancient creeds.

In one province alone the law was inoperative. Constantius Chlorus, the Emperor of the West, felt that his position was a perilous one. With 12,000 fair-haired Tungrians he had to line the Severn and the Dee, and watch, without provoking, the fierce Welsh. With as many dark-eyed Moors he had to guard against the mountaineers of Scotland. A third legion garrisoned London, York, Colchester, and kept up the communications of the Continent; whilst Welsh contingents, like Skinner's irregular horse, performed police duties, kept down the Celtic and Teutonic tribes of South Britain,* and repulsed incessant Saxon attacks from the Baltic on the eastern coast. The navy, too, seems to have been entirely manned with British seamen, and Constantius, therefore, was, even more than Galerius, dependant upon native support. To secure this, he had married the Princess of Caermarthen, and boldly quitting his legions, and establishing his residence on the hills of Caernarvon, without any large force, had won the hearts of the mountain tribes, whom it was his interest to secure, by trusting his life and crown to

* There is no reason for belief that the southern peasantry of Britain differed materially from their present representatives. The great bulk of the Saxon population must have perished either at Hastings, or have been transferred to Normandy by the colonies William took over to replace the Norman settlers here. The modern Norman of Normandy is really the old Saxon. The South of Britain was never inhabited by the ancestors of the Welsh, but by brown-haired Allic tribes, the Belgæ.

Digitized by Google

their friendship. Especially he by personal intercourse sought to win upon the Druids of the north, and the Basilidians of the colonies of London, Verulam, York, Chester, and Colchester.

In Britain, Constantius had four religions to deal with. The swarthy South Welsh tribes professed Hebrew Christianity, if the term be lawful. The red-haired North Welsh, still Druid, extended their influence and their priesthood through the villages of England. The Roman colonists worshipped Jupiter, and believed in Isis. The Gallic legionaries looked to Odin, the war-god of the North.

And what was the faith of Constantius himself? If we may judge by the golden tablet found in his country-seat, Coed Helena, and yet preserved at Caernarvon, that of Basilides. He was a nominal unbaptized Christian, yet a worshipper of Isis, but above all a believer in himself; in other words, a Pantheist, like half the philosophers of the present day.

In Gaul, where the legions, recruited from abroad, seemed mere tools, and the people were disarmed and powerless, the laws of Dioclesian were at least partially carried into effect. In Britain, however, the legions, brigaded with mountain auxiliaries, had largely intermarried with them, and were probably in part also filled up by Christians, who were glad to find, under the shadow of the eagles, a refuge from the rack.* Hence, when Dioclesian's edicts were promulgated by Constantius, the officers of the army generally threw up their commissions. To accept their resignation, would have been to grant the independence of Britain. Constantius not only re-appointed them, but, having thus secured their fealty, gradually expelled all who had shown any disposition to obey the Pontiff rather than himself. What could be more natural than that his wife's kinsmen should accept commissions in their sovereign's guards, as these commissions were thus rendered vacant?

The time at length arrived to strike. Dioclesian had resigned the Empire. The army in Gaul, we may suspect, as well as in Britain, had been filled up with Constantius' own clansmen and followers. Having intermarried with, he could not afford to despise them. Thus, for the first time

* Precisely the same thing occurred under wicked Queen Mary. The British army, then serving in the Netherlands, and brigaded with Lutherans, afforded a refuge for many Protestants who, having large estates in England, were unwilling to relinquish them to Romanist hands by quitting their country altogether, but who found that on service no questions would be asked, and that Lutheran worship was at least accessible.

Digitized by Google

in Roman history, the crown, instead of being despoiled by mercenary legions, was to be fought for by a national army under its native king, and the strife was between the British people and the Roman Pontiff.

The death of Constantius brought matters to a crisis. His son Constantine, a Briton by birth and a half Briton by blood, was a proud chief and a daring one. The priesthood had sought to slay him. The Pontiff was his enemy. He felt that every moment's delay endangered his pontificate. He called on Constantine to put Dioclesian's edicts in force. The movement was no more a religious one than the Waterloo campaign, nevertheless the Roman Pontiff found it advisable to rely, in part at least, on religious ceremonies and moral force. The rites of Cybele were performed, and amidst slaughtered infants, and embowelled virgins, and youths hewn across by the imperial hands, the unholy forms of the Alyss were believed to appear before the trembling tyrant, and assure him of their aid.

When Satan thus clearly manifested his power on the side of evil, Constantine had but one course. All men allowed Christ's power, although few admired his holiness. The Christians already despised heathen magic. Might not their general, by declaring that the aid of Christ was promised to his cause, animate the Basilidians, who did not deny his majesty, and believed his power to work miracles, although they did not allow Him to be one with the Supreme? Why not hoist as the standard of victory that badge dear to the Christian as emblem of his salvation, but known to the Gnostic Isiacs as the mystic Tau, the key of knowledge, the emblem of initiation?

The battle of the Milvian Bridge followed.

Here let us pause: we may gain more by considering what Gibbon does not mention, than by studying the facts he does adduce. What was then the real creed of the Roman people?

Most of them seem to have been believers in the unity of all creeds when fully understood, members of the mysteries, expectants of a future spiritual existence, totally ignorant of sin as a spiritual disease, and to have regarded things as evil only so far as they proved injurious to man, not as they are offensive to the holiness of God.

In other words, the great delusion of the Semitic race, whether Boodist, Vishnoovee, Brahmin,* as distinguished

* Much confusion arises in our popular views of India, from confounding the Hindostanee population of Northern India, who are evidently Semitic, with the Telingas or Tamul of the South, who are a *black* race, closely

from the Hamitic Seeva worship, Sooffee Moslem, or orthodox Turk, consists in regarding *the body* as the sole source of evil, overlooking the necessity of spiritual renewal, yielding to the belief that happiness consists in passive contemplation, not in the gift of the Most High. Man's soul is placed on the throne of the Supreme. The delusion of the race of Japheth has been, on the other hand, that of seeking salvation by active energy and the might of their own right hands, by stern endurance and by destruction of the enemies of their Deity, by self-development rather than self-negation. Both are equally open to temptation, but the temptations most dangerous to each take an exactly opposite form. The one tends invariably, when unrestrained by grace, to Virgin worship, as that of embodied purity and endurance; the other to reverence to some hero-king—to make an Odin, a Charlemagne, a Napoleon, its god.

Now let us calmly examine the exact position of Constantine at this juncture. We may best understand it by comparison. Let us for a moment suppose that a British Napoleon, with a small army composed of English and Irish Episcopalians, Scotch Presbyterians, Welsh Methodists, and Irish Roman Catholics, had conquered the whole Roman Empire, and that, in order to heal all dissensions and unite all parties, he allowed the College of Cardinals to elect and consecrate him as Pope, with a view of combining and governing all creeds under one head. This would be precisely the position of Constantine. His first step would probably be to license the celebration of Episcopalian and Presbyterian worship everywhere on the Continent, as lawful forms of dissent; to encourage the Italian people rather to join the new worship, and thus to quit their own nationality. He might then go further, and treat both Presbyterian and Episcopalian ministers as validly ordained, and might conclude with each a sort of concordat, similar to that contracted with Ignatius Loyola. If in any place Protestant worship had been suppressed, and Protestant estates confiscated, he would of course restore them. In the Church of Rome, he would himself promote the most tolerant and liberal-minded of the priesthood. He would, in fact, endeavour to reconcile, or rather to keep all parties in har-

allied with the Ethiopian, and who have everywhere been conquered by the Hindoo, just as the Hindoo in his turn has been conquered by the Mussulman tribes of the North. All three are therefore now *intermingled*, although the difference of creed prevents their being intermixed. Generally, however, the Hindoos worship the female, the Telingas the male principle, like the ancient Egyptians, their kinsmen.

Digitized by Google

mony as much as possible. He would be in the position of King Leopold, the nominally Protestant head of the Roman Catholic Church in Belgium. And it is possible that motives of worldly expediency might lead men in general to approve this system and to support the rule of the new Pontiff, and that even good and pious men, finding themselves a mere handful in the mass, might submit without publicly attacking what in heart they disapproved.

Now this position, of course, could only be held by a man naturally great, but not savingly converted. He might have much respect for truth, great anxiety for its diffusion, but, it is evident, not enough love for the Saviour to risk empire on his behalf. He would act on the principle of worldly expediency, to do the utmost possible good to others at the least possible danger to himself.

Now his first task to restore the whole of the property and funds of which the Church had been deprived, of itself led to fresh troubles. Let us suppose that the entire wealth, not only of the English Church, but of all other Christian denominations, including the private fortunes of their members, having been confiscated for many years, an order was suddenly issued restoring it simply to all *Christians*. Can we doubt that a vast number of "*Christians*" would at once start up, and that millions who cared little about the Cross would come forward to divide the coin? But there could exist no touchstone. For ten years there had been no regular pastors, no fixed congregations. Any man who pronounced the Creed, and stated himself to have been baptized, was, of course, a member of the Church. But their pastors had perished. New ones had to be chosen. The Pontiff named the Heathen priesthood; he left the *licensed* churches to choose their own pastors, just as the Pope now lets the Jesuits and Franciscans and Maronites elect their own chiefs. But were those pastors chosen by *Christians?* Neither popular elections nor state patronage can secure the appointment of holy pastors, unless the Spirit of God be vouchsafed.*

* "When the Empire was converted, multitudes, as is very plain, came into the Church on but partly religious motives, and with habits and opinions influenced by the false worship which they had previously abandoned." "To this tendency must be added the hazard which attended the development of the Catholic ritual, such as the honour publicly assigned to saints and martyrs, the formal veneration of their relics, and the images and observances which followed. What was to hinder the rise of a sort of modern Pantheism?" These words are not ours. They are *Mr. Newman's*, since his perversion. ("Essay on Development," p. 447.) We honour his candour, and thank him for his confession.

Digitized by Google

No one can, we think, doubt that under such circumstances the Basilidians would call themselves Christians, or that their secret organization would enable them to exercise great weight in the selection of "priests" and episcopoi. We use the word "priests" purposely, for the Basilidian heresy of a sacrificial priesthood had sunk deep into the Church. We believe further that nothing would be more easy, under such circumstances, than for the same men, carefully drilled, to attend a dozen congregations successively. At this epoch, acclamation, or show of hands, elected the priesthood, boys and even women shouted, and, of course, at each election the voices of these men could be brought to bear. Hence it appears almost uncontestable that vacancies in the Christian Church would, in nine cases out of ten, be filled up by Basilidian worshippers, whilst, on the other hand, these Basilidian worshippers would be compelled to mask their real creed, to cover it with a show of Christianity, and to lead the Emperor and the people to believe that they were Christians at heart as well as in name. True Christians, under such circumstances, who had for ten years been left without spiritual communion and without the Bible, would hesitate to come forward as pastors, lest they might ignorantly mislead.

However this may be, Gnosticism, from this moment, nearly disappeared. What, then, became of the Gnostics? They had till now, by all accounts, outnumbered the orthodox five-fold. They surely did not all die off. We can hardly believe that they, at the top of the drum, became converted into genuine Christians. They did not merge into the mysteries of Isis worship, for these were no longer recognised as lawful by the state. What, then, became of them? They must have united with the Church, just as, continuing our comparison, the Roman Catholics of Ireland would merge into the Established Church, if a King of England were elected Pope, and the Established Church, without any legal change, without any corporate act of her own, would thus find herself insensibly swamped by foul and abominable idolatry, which she would have no power to expel or reject.

We see now the first result of Constantine's restoration of the confiscated wealth of the Church to the Christians generally, without first attempting to define a guard against the intrusion of improper members. Mob government and State interference may be alike perilous to real spirituality. The wisest course would have been, so far as we can judge, to have intrusted the ecclesiastical organization of each district to those still surviving confessors who had proved their love

Digitized by Google

to Christ by ten years of suffering for His sake. He, however, probably looked at the whole affair as political capital, and was anxious to enrol as many Christians as possible, for the sake of their moral support against heathen reaction. By throwing open the doors of the Church to all who came, he admitted the messengers of Satan as well as the ambassadors of Christ. The garrison was recruited, but the recruits were for the most part disguised enemies, who no sooner saw their strength than they seized the citadel.

Now, in a very short time, the results of this became apparent. The elected pastors represented the majority of those who elected them. The minority was not represented at all. Thus, whilst Hosius Paphnutius and the suffering confessors seem to have taught Christ crucified, the northern settlers of Thrace and Asia Minor seem by a sort of compromise to have selected teachers who held as little as possible of doctrinal Christianity, and the more ignorant and unlettered population of Syria, Egypt, Africa, and the South, selected rather those who were distinguished by intense fanaticism, by their ascetic frenzy, by their impassioned appeals, and, in part, by their sympathy with that great mass of the population who still worshipped the Virgin Queen.

Under these circumstances, the question naturally arose as to what constitutes a Christian. Whilst Hosius and his Western friends maintained the necessity of belief in Christ and Him crucified, and of his future reign, the Northerns reduced the Gospel into a mere philosophical formula; and the Eastern, worked up by their visions, by their asceticism, and by the magic and mesmerism of the priests of Isis, contended that the third person of the Holy Trinity, once revealed in Athor, had again become incarnate in the Virgin* Mary. All could not be true! Could they be reconciled? It was easy to see the approach of danger. Three different creeds of Christianity, predominating in different districts, might break up the empire. Let the Isis worshippers call

* At the Council of Nice, the Melchite section held that there were three *persons in the Trinity, the Father, the Virgin Mary, and the Messiah their Son.* ("Nimrod," iii., p. 329.) Why were not these arch-heretics expelled the Church? Simply because the true Church was in a very miserable minority. The remarkable similarity of the Melchite, or Egypto-Christian, with the Egypto-idolatrous Trinity, may be seen in Wilkinson: Osiris, Seba, and Netpe, or Athor; in other districts, Horus, Isis, and Mondooli. (Wilkinson, v., p. 36.) In all Oriental Trinities, it is one Supreme Being, a Bride, in whom dwells his spirit, but who herself is formed out of the earth, and their Son, superior to his mother in his heavenward, but subject to her in his earthly relations.

Digitized by Google

their goddess by her name in the mysteries, "Maia;" let the Christians tolerate a worship addressed to the Lord through his Virgin Mother! Why should not Maia be identified with Mary? Why might not each worship his own goddess at the same temple? Why might not these creeds be fused into one?

The Emperor summoned a General Council of Bishops, fallible men themselves, elected in the manner we have pointed out, and called on them to declare what should constitute a Christian. We must pity his perplexity, and remember that the difficulties to which we now call attention were perfectly new to him.

The Council of Three met. Arius, Hosius, and the Mariamites found themselves opposed. Now there is nothing clearer, that whilst great good arises out of the conferences of men having the like object, nothing but evil proceeds from the conferences of men whose objects are exactly opposite, and who meet only to defeat each other. Were the General Assembly of the Free Church combined in one promiscuous meeting with the Wesleyan Conference, the Synod of Exeter, and the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales, the Quakers' yearly meeting, and the Mormonite muster, in order to settle the confession of all, the minority, however composed, to accept the decision of a mere numerical majority as fixing absolute truth—can we believe that edification would result, or any benefit to the Church, except so far as one class of heretics might neutralize its opposite, and thus secure toleration to the really faithful? Precisely thus it occurred at Nice, so far as we can judge. The Christian party appears to have been lamentably small. The Syro-Egyptian, or followers of the Virgin, more numerous by far, and the philosophic Arian, or, as we should now call it, the High and Dry School, stronger than either separately, but inferior to both united. Hence followed compromise. As in all similar cases, the two smaller parties combined against the one larger. To secure recognition of our Lord's very Godhead, Hosius was compelled to abstain from assailing those who also held the Virgin to be Divine. The worshippers of the Virgin, again, supported Hosius against the philosophers of the north, because they saw that his defeat would leave the philosophers at liberty to attack them. Asceticism was tolerated—it was all that good men could do to prevent its being enforced. Anxious to maintain the true Divinity of the Lord, they tolerated superstitions, and did not inquire the motives of those who supported them.

Digitized by Google

Thus it would appear that whilst the ostensible result of the Council of Nice was the defeat of the Thracian deniers of our Lord's perfect Divinity, yet that defeat was secured only by accepting the aid of auxiliaries who speedily converted the victory to their own purposes. "And thus the Arian question opened a controversy it did not settle. It discovered a new sphere, if we may so speak, to the worlds of light to which the Church had not yet assigned its inhabitant. Then there was a wonder in heaven! a throne was seen far above all created powers, mediatorial, intercessory, a title, a crown bright as the Morning Star—a glory issuing from the eternal throne. Robes, pure as the heavens, *and a sceptre over all.* And who was the predestined heir of this Majesty? *Who was that wisdom, and what was her name?* The mother of fair love, and fear, and holy hope, exalted like a palm-tree in Engeddi, and a rose plant in Jericho, created from the beginning before the world, in God's councils, and in Jerusalem was her power! The vision was found in the Apocalypse, a woman clothed with the sun, and with the moon under her feet. And upon her head a crown of twelve stars. The votaries of Mary do not exceed the true faith, unless the blasphemers of her Son come up to it. The Church of Rome is not idolatrous unless Arianism is orthodoxy."*

Translated into plain Norman-English, this half German rhapsody simply means that the *professing* followers of Christ, finding themselves unable to outvote the philosophic followers of Arius, and not choosing for some cause or other to call in the really Christian clergy of Britain and Armenia, qualified the followers of Isis as Christians, enlisted them as voters against Arius, and allowed them to continue the worship of their favourite goddess without asking questions. Out of the mouth of the enemy we have this confession. Comment were needless. "But to carry out their arrangement the rulers of the Church had to go farther. Confiding, then, in the power of *Christianity,* to resist the infection of evil, and to transmute the very instruments and appendages of demon worship to an evangelical use; and feeling also that these usages had originally come from primitive † revelations, and from the

* Mr. Newman on Development, p. 403.

† Were those revelations from above or beneath? This question Mr. Newman does not pretend to answer, nor does he give any reasons for believing them which would not equally apply to those awful visions recently obtained at Paris, and which have also, if report say true, so powerfully shaken the mind of the King of Prussia. Yet Mr. Newman would at once declare the latter Satanic. Why not then the former as well?

Digitized by Google

instinct of nature, though they had been corrupted, and that they must invent what they needed, and that they had with them the very archetypes of that which Paganism had attained the shadows. In the course of the fourth century two movements or developments spread over the face of Christendom, with a rapidity characteristic of the Church, the one ascetic, the other ritual or ceremonial. The use of temples and those dedicated to particular saints, and ornamented on occasions with branches of trees, incense, lamps, and candles, votive offerings on recovering from illness, holy water, asylums, holidays and seasons, use of processions, blessings on the fields, sacred vestments, the tonsure, the ring in marriage, bowing to the east, images at a later date, perhaps the ecclesiastical charts, are all of Pagan origin, and sanctioned by adoption into the Church."*

It is no pleasing task thus to expose the defects, the wanderings, the sins of the early Church, but the truth must be told. Assailed on one side by Arian infidelity, on the other by Eastern apostasy, whilst yet writhing under the wounds inflicted by Roman polytheism, the ancient Christians looked to the Pagan Emperor, the Antichrist, and gladly availed themselves of every aid they could procure. Meanwhile the professors of the Gospel seemed to have been saved by the counteraction of these contending elements. They, to a certain extent, neutralized each other, and whilst the true Church was then, as it has ever been, a small minority, we have no reason to doubt that whilst Arius and Athanasius were battling for victory, the servants of Christ were in many congregations preaching the Gospel, and teaching the way to eternal life. The wrath of man was restrained. The Church enjoyed a pause from active persecution, and the Word of God went forth, and was glorified in the conversion of myriads. Whilst Arians and Melchites fought for place and power, holy men, each in their own sphere, quietly preached Christ.

We must, however, bear in mind two great points connected with the second Council of Nice, which are overlooked by Church historians. The first of these is, that there were none but Greek or Latin Bishops summoned, and that consequently the whole of the British, Armenian, and Mesopotamian Churches, the only ones which had received and retained pure apostolic teaching, were *de facto* excluded. Neither does there appear to have been any converted Goths, so that the assemblage, far from being an Œcumenical Council, was simply a religious conference between a certain number of self-appointed delegates, who had no more right to legislate

* Newman, p. 358.

Digitized by Google

for others than the Temperance Congress of Massachusetts to interfere with the laws of Scotland. The second one, almost equally important, is, that the Arians, although expelled from their Churches, were neither convinced nor silenced. Those who were Arians before, were Arians still. Their existence was a great fact. But the vacant Churches had to be filled up. We have seen that the true Church was but a small flock. The Mariamites and Melchites were, of course, clamorous for reward. Their votes had to be paid for. Superstition took the place of scepticism. Egyptian monks filled the pulpits of Greek philosophers. Filth and folly were substituted for intellectual pride and brilliant but useless rhetoric. Hence a fierce reaction soon followed against the intruders. The heresy that Arius had introduced, now became national. Men took part with their clansfolk, and the population of Asia Minor and Thrace revolted from an Egyptian priesthood, just as Scotchmen would revolt at having Hindoo pastors forcibly intruded upon them. The struggle soon became political. Each party sought for aid from without. The Mariamites* appealed to the passions, the credulity, the superstitions of the populace, the Arians to the pride, the prejudice of the higher classes—and to the northern contempt for Asiatic superstition—to the scrutinizing and sceptical character of the Gothic and Scandinavian—and at length to the swords of the soldiery. To call the struggle one purely religious, is folly. It was the old war of scepticism against superstition—of the unconverted sons of Japheth against the unrenewed offspring of Ham—of aristocracy against democracy—of the white against the coloured race—of the north against the south. Unsanctified learning, unpurified intellect, untiring energy, all were on the side of the Arian—numbers, zeal, fanaticism, and blind intensity of purpose on that of the Virgin goddess. But the hosts who believed in Isis, and who clamoured to Mary for protection, were controlled, as is always the case in the Eastern world, by sterner spirits, conscious of the falsehood of their cause, deserters from their own people, men who used the masses but as tools for self-aggrandizement. If an Eastern people throw off the yoke of its white masters, it speedily afterwards

* A distinction should be drawn between the Mariamites and the Melchites, which constitutes the real difference between the Greek and Roman Churches still. The one holds that the Godhead dwelt in the Virgin from her birth; the other that she was deified and invested with omnipotence or admission to heaven. Yet it is fair to state that the recent decisions of the Roman See approximate so closely to the Greek superstition as to render it very probable the two may combine.

Digitized by Google

yields itself to the lash of its own white slaves. The superstition which conducts its votaries to fame, wealth, and power may itself be suspected. Without European leadership the Seiks would never have met the power of Britain. Yet who believes that Ventura, Allard, or Avitabile were really Seiks in belief? Whilst the dark races develope their systems they always seek either white or Arab aid to carry them through and force them upon others.*

Into the short but fierce reaction under Julian the Apostate,† and the sifting of the Church which followed, space forbids us to enter any more than into the brief peace which ensued under Jovian and his successors. For twelve years Valentinia seems, avoiding all Ecclesiastical Councils, *to have kept the peace.*‡ The Word of God was thus allowed free course. Everywhere the wheat was sown, and the tares with it. Were we to point out the period at which the Gospel had been diffused most widely, and might, according to the rules of *worldly* calculations, have been expected soonest to overcome all opposition, it would be A.D. 375.

Here, then, we must pause, for we have reached the close of one of those great cycles which divide the history of man. All writers—Protestant, Papal, Pagan—allow that from the day of Pentecost, till the middle of A.D. 376, Christ went forth in the power of his Spirit, conquering and to conquer, until the idols everywhere fell before Him; and at the accession of Gratian, the vast fabric of Paganism suddenly collapsed and fell without a stroke, leaving the Church everywhere triumphant, and Christ alone recognised by the multitude as King. All allow that from the close of A.D.

* This is very remarkably illustrated in the history of Joseph. Men talk often of Joseph as if he had been sold to labour, forgetful that office in Egypt is *the birthright of white slaves,* who are thus educated for posts to which the natives are incompetent, just as Swiss youths are enlisted or crimped to make soldiers in Italy. Joseph was as much a Hebrew Mamlouk, as Ali Mourad, or the celebrated Hassan Bey.

† It is, however, worthy of remark that it was at Pergamos, "where Satan's seat is," that Julian offered his invocations to the fiend, and was in the hidden crypts of the temple, initiated as a member of "*the left hand mysteries,*" and taught *the depths of evil.*

‡ The writer desires not to underrate the perils of Arianism, because the Arians of the third century may have been a more *intellectually* refined and a mentally superior class to the dirty monks of Egypt. He regards Arianism as a spiritual consumption, of all diseases the most deadly; but which does not necessarily disfigure the outward countenance of the sufferer whom it slays. The Arians were proud, unconverted, ungodly; but it does not follow that they were like the monks—filthy in their persons, or frantic in their reveries, or deliberate forgers of false miracles for fraudulent ends.

Digitized by Google

376 a rapid change began, and one so fearful that we find within fourteen years the Heathen high priesthood revived in a Christian Bishop; the worship of the Mother of the Gods, till then carried on by Chaldean sodalites in secret, or in Basilidian conventicles, everywhere substituted and established for the faith of Christ, and the confession of his name confined to the Mesopotamian mountains, the Welsh fastnesses, and the Alpine rocks.

From A.D. 33 to A.D. 376 the great feature of history is the struggle of truth with Paganism, with philosophy, and with Pantheism. From A.D. 376 to A.D. 719, Christianity well-nigh disappears from the scene, and nothing is visible but the long flashing broadswords * of the Gothic and Arabian chivalry above a sea of blood. Was then the primitive Church so far wrong in assigning to this period the fulfilment of the first seal in the book of Revelation? "And I saw, and behold a white horse: and he that sat thereon had a bow; and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering, and to conquer." (Rev. vi. 2.) †

Without here questioning the lawfulness of Mr. Elliott's application of this to the microcosm of the Western Empire, it seems to us to indicate far greater and more glorious scenes. Certain it is that the wheat was scattered widely, with, it is admitted, the tares too, during this period; but in that which succeeded the tares supplanted the wheat, until both tares and wheat were trampled into mire under the feet of the northern war horse, and the Arab charger.

To the present writer the imagery of the seal in question appears purely Oriental. In the first place, the white or cream-coloured horse is especially Syrian. It is never ridden by a warrior in the field, for the simple reason that its colour renders the rider so ready a mark for every missile. *It is reserved for kings when they go forth to show mercy.* The

* The early Arabs used the long straight broadsword, the "*romphaia*" of Scriptûre, as their descendants, the sons of Abdool Wahabs, do now. The curved scimitar is a Persian or Tartar weapon from the East. It is not generally preferred by very stalwart races, its power depending on quickness of wrist, whilst the straight sword only requires determination to strike home.

† If asked who are the riders upon the four horses (Rev. vi.), the writer would reply in the words of Zech. i. 8,—"I saw by night, and behold a man riding upon a red horse, and he stood among the myrtle trees that were in the bottom; and behind him were there red horses, speckled, and white. And the man that stood among the myrtle trees answered and said, These are they whom the Lord hath sent to walk to and fro through the earth." (v. 10.) He accepts the fact, and leaves to others the explanation, perhaps not yet revealed to any.

Digitized by Google

cream-coloured horses kept up by our own Sovereigns for State purposes are relics of the feudal customs. Mr. Urquhart mentions that whilst he was recently in Morocco, a large number of rebels had been sentenced to death. The hour of execution arrived. Impalement, burning, and every slow torture which disgraces humanity was before them. But that morning the Sultan called, not for the black steed on which he always rode to the Chamber of Judgment, nor the sorrel or red charger which he mounted in battle, but the white or cream-coloured courser, reserved for occasions either of sport or joy. No farther intimation of pardon was needed. The moment the white horse appeared, the pardoned rebels had only to rush forward, touch it, and their petitions could not legally be refused. They were free and restored to favour, as if they had never failed in their faith.

Hence, then, considering that John wrote as an Oriental to Orientals, it does not seem probable that he intended to denote as the principal figure in his vision an Emperor of Rome, under symbols which no Oriental would ever conceive to signify anything Roman.

But this is not all. The bow was the last instrument which either a Hebrew of the later date, or Roman, would select to betoken a conqueror. The bow was used only as a weapon of the chase by the Romans, not of war. Let any man who doubts try whether he could use the bow on horseback in a Roman saddle without stirrups, drawing to his breast in the old Roman way. With it he might, if his obedient horse halted, shoot deer overtaken and brought to bay; but his light missile could never pierce an armed enemy. So far were the Romans from using the bow, that it was never employed by line infantry in war, still less by knights.

Hence, then, it is possible that the language of the Apostle describes the whole period during which the Gospel struggled for supremacy. If so, the remark must strike as not unworthy of consideration, that this period consisted of seven jubilees, neither more nor less. What if this measure of time were found to apply to the other great epochs of the book of Revelation, and that instead of being mere arbitrary periods, they alike represent those great cycles in the history of the universe which fill up man's history till his King returns.

It may be said that if this be true, Christ's coming must be far off. Not so! If these views are correct, we are now far advanced into the sixth seal, and are in the midst of those days which we are emphatically told *shall be shortened for the elect's sake*. How much, we know not. With the breaking

Digitized by Google

of the seventh seal begins Christ's reign upon earth. The seventh seal, the seventh trumpet, and the seventh vial have been thought by many commentators to synchronize.*

On these views we would not dogmatize. We do not insist upon them. We throw them out merely for thought, for criticism, and for investigation. Their incorrectness does not invalidate the facts we have stated. Very different inferences may be drawn from the same facts, by abler and better men. They do not affect the question whether or no Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse, *or* the Pope *the* Antichrist?

Our next task will be one far more difficult, for very carefully have Popish writers striven to veil from view the real origin of their apostate Church; and it will require alike the spirit of truth and of love to rend aside the coverings which have been piled up to hide her iniquity. Well has she been called the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth; for by her sorceries *all* nations, whether they submit to her or not, have been unconsciously more or less deceived. It is not necessary that nations or individual men should knowingly sympathize with Rome for them to be made by Jesuit craft her unconscious tools. The most fanatic Brahmen may at this moment unconsciously be engaged in carrying out schemes devised at Rome, matured by Jesuit craft, and arranged by Satanic ingenuity; for the network of organization spread over mankind extends from China and Thibet to the very heart of Africa. We may hereafter call attention to some startling facts relating to this movement, which show that its abettors sometimes assume a very different garb and language from that which rightly belongs to them, as priests of Rome, and we shall then have to bring the facts we have quoted to bear on the great issue—Is or is not Rome the Babylon of the Apocalypse?

* Whether this be so or not, or whether, as the present writer thinks, the seven trumpets sound, and the seven vials are poured out, at the first jubilee of the seventh seal, just as Jericho fell at dawn of the seventh day, is, however, a point on which he would decline to dogmatize. Certain, however, it is that none of those judgments *requires* more than 396 days for its infliction, if the time be taken literally. The writer is inclined to think that they will occupy but 2,300 days altogether, although he would be far from denying that those 2,300 days may be but the winding up—the completion of what has been preparing during the previous 2,300 years, just as Ezekiel's lying on his back for certain days, and the siege of Jerusalem for that same period corresponded to the number of years of Jewish apostasy.

Digitized by Google

Art. III.—THE AGE TO COME: A FRIENDLY APPEAL TO ALL WHO LOVE THE LORD.

Remembering the blessedness of the peace-maker, we venture very humbly, but very earnestly and affectionately, to solicit the attention of our brethren to a few thoughts on this vital subject.

The reader is supposed to love the Lord, and to love his "appearing." But fixing his eye, it may be, on certain distortions of the prophetic future which some writers have broached, he shrinks from the thought of the Advent's possible nearness, believing that much yet remains to be done on the earth before the day of salvation finally closes. Accustomed, especially, to look forward to a season of signal blessing as awaiting the Heathen, he repudiates a theory which announces the speedy advent of a day of wrath, which shall involve within its ample sweep the *entire* earth, laying waste all regions and kingdoms *alike.*

We sympathize with this view. Did our idea of the prophetic future carry with it the belief that, at the Lord's premillennial Advent, the vast millions of Heathendom should be visited with a penal infliction of wrath similar to that penal and exterminating infliction which shall then overtake nominal Christendom as the righteous award of a just God for *its* wilful rejection of the Gospel, we should feel that there were many passages in the Bible which such a theory failed to account for and to explain, as well as certain great principles of the Divine government which it tended to overbear.

There is, however, an aspect of the prophetic future, in favour of which we are not without the hope of enlisting at once the reader's judgment and his sympathy. Our object is not to make out a case. It is simply to inquire, What saith the Lord? If, as Lord Bacon has it, it be the province of the student of God's works simply to "ask questions at Nature," and to "interpret" her replies, not less emphatically is it the province of the student of God's word simply to ask questions at the Bible, and to interpret its replies. The men who, to save a physical theory, denied the earth's motion round the sun, and consigned the observer of the fact to the prison of the Inquisition, heard, in their victim's triumphant whisper, "Still it moves!" the sentence which all posterity would concur in pronouncing upon their impotent folly. We ourselves were once not less dogmatic in denying the possibility of the Lord's premillennial Advent. Met at almost

Digitized by Google

every step by Bible-sayings, which our old hereditary theory did not in any rational way explain, we, instead of modifying the theory so as to embrace and account for all the Bible-sayings, insisted on modifying and distorting the sayings in order to save our theory. Now, however, we are not ashamed to acknowledge our utter inability to form the faintest conception of what God shall do in the future, except by examining, with child-like docility, the prophetic Word, and ascertaining what He himself has said He will do. The prophetic Word, we now see, is given for this very end. It is "a light shining in a dark place"—not, as we once fancied, a dark place itself. The Revelation, or Apocalypse, is something *made known*, not something hidden—it is a revealing, an unveiling. And to that light, shining like the mariner's friendly pole-star in the dark night, we do well that we take heed.

Amidst much remaining uncertainty on many points, we discern certain great outlines which appear to us to account for not a few Bible-sayings, not otherwise explicable. Will the friendly reader confer with us for a little space, whilst we indicate these outlines very briefly? The leading positions we shall first simply state, and then we shall advert to those Bible-sayings on which the position, which we deem the cardinal one, appears to be based. If to some of our readers much we are about to say seem elementary, we trust they will bear with us for the sake of those who as yet are only learners.

I. The starting-point is the *First Resurrection*. In Rev. xx., are announced two resurrections; the one at the beginning of the thousand years, the other after these have expired. "The rest of the dead," we read, "lived not again till the thousand years were finished." This teaches obviously that some are raised at the beginning of the thousand years; that none are raised during the thousand years; and that the rest are raised at their close.

Who are the *persons* thus raised at the beginning of the millennium? Three things are mentioned about them. (1) They are "blessed and holy;" (2) they are beyond the reach of the second death, *i.e.*, of wrath; (3) they live and reign with Christ. These marks at once settle the *class* of persons who have part in the first resurrection. They are all *saints;* it is exclusively a resurrection of saints.

Objec. But, though all who are then raised be saints, are all the saints raised? Did not the apostle see only "the souls of them who were *beheaded for the witness of Jesus?*" And

Digitized by Google

does not that point exclusively to the *martyrs?* *Ans.* It *is* a martyr-company. But that company is not limited to those who literally have been "beheaded." It includes all who "have not worshipped the beast." And who are these? In Rev. xiii. 8, all are represented as "worshipping the beast," except those whose names are "written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." This shows that, according to the language of the Apocalypse, the raised saints comprehend *all who in every age have witnessed for Christ against Satan and his seed.* They are a martyr-company, though all have not been summoned away from the scaffold or from the stake. They *all* have come out of "great tribulation:" that was their living martyrdom.

With these risen saints are associated the saints who at that day "are alive and remain." "The dead in Christ," we read in 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, "shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." This is the "gathering together" of which Paul speaks in 2 Thess. ii. 1. The two classes of saints—those who have fallen asleep and those who are alive and remain—form one blessed martyr-company.

These saints have, *all* of them, *glorified bodies.* The saints who had fallen asleep are raised incorruptible. The saints who are alive and remain are changed. These form a *distinct company* during the millennial glory. The kingdom or reign of the saints, is limited to those who have glorified bodies. They *alone* reign with Christ during the thousand years.

Christ appears personally to accomplish the bodily resurrection. Plainly He is present, when the event described in 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, occurs. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout," are the words of the inspired apostle, "with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we," &c. So that, if the bodily resurrection of the saints occur before the millennium, the Lord Jesus comes premillennially. To the proofs of this premillennial resurrection we shall advert afterwards. Meanwhile we assume it. Assuming this, we conclude the Lord is come, and has gathered together unto Him all who are His up to that hour. This is our first position.

II. *Where* are the risen and "changed" saints to reign? In Dan. vii., the scene of their reign is declared to be identical (speaking generally) with the scene of the fourth kingdom.

Digitized by Google

The fourth beast or kingdom is "cast into the burning flame." (Dan. vii. 11.) The fourth beast includes not the Papacy merely, as an ecclesiastical system, but all, within the scene of the ten kingdoms, who have worshipped the beast—who are not followers of the Lamb. For it is not "the little horn" only which is cast into the burning flame, but the beast with its ten horns, and this "because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake."

The wrath is executed on the apostasy through the agency of actual fire. As the scene of the antediluvian apostasy was purged by a baptism with water, the scene of this more terrible apostasy shall be purged by a baptism of fire.

Out of this fiery baptism the earth, *i.e.*, the scene of the apostasy, comes forth purged from its stain of blood. A memorial indeed remains upon it, telling of the awful doom which has overtaken this guilty Sodom: "The land thereof," we read, Isaiah xxxiv. 9, "shall become burning pitch: it shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever." And in Rev. xix. 3, "Her smoke rose up for ever and ever." This destruction of Antichrist has been effected by a personally-present Christ. The *seat* of the beast—Rome or Italy—becomes, it would appear, a great smoking volcano—a visible and enduring memorial, like Sodom, of the just wrath of God. But the rest of the scene, which had been defiled by the presence of the beast, emerges a new earth—a fit place for the saints' reign.

But where have the risen and changed saints been during the visitation of wrath? In some hiding-place, some chamber of safety. "Come, my people," the Lord is represented as saying, in immediate anticipation of the wrath, "enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast." They "meet the Lord in the air." How this is done we know not; the day shall declare it.

Objec. But does not the fact that the saints are caught up to meet the Lord in the air imply that they do not return to this earth? *Ans.* In the parable of the marriage the five wise virgins go forth to meet the bridegroom; and then they escort him back again to the bridal chamber from which they had issued. In like manner shall not the saints go forth to meet their descending King, and (after an interval) escort him to this earth, the scene of the marriage of the Lamb?

"We shall reign on the earth." The kingdom, the fourth beast, is now removed. The scene of the apostasy is purged. The immediate *seat* of the beast is an appalling pit of fire, And as the smoke of the pit ascends, the saints sing their

Digitized by Google

"Allelujah," praising the Lord for His righteous judgments; like Israel that day, standing on the shore of the Red Sea, rejoicing that the Lord had cast into the depths of the sea Pharaoh and his God-defying host. The kingdom is given to the saints of the Most High.

The destruction of Antichrist, not less than the previous rapture of the saints, implies Christ's personal presence. Christ is come. His manifestation to his enemies has brought with it, not conversion, but wrath; and that wrath has prepared the way for the succeeding reign of his saints upon the (prophetic) earth. His habitual presence, be it remembered, is confined exclusively to the glorified saints.

III. But what meanwhile has been transpiring *elsewhere?* Has Heathendom—China, for example, or India—shared in this wrath? Both the prophetic word and the method of God's jurisprudence seem to say, No.

1. In Dan. vii., for example, the central idea of the prophecy appears to be that the fourth kingdom and the fifth are territorially identical. The latter supplants, and is erected on the ruins of, the former. In other words, the scene of the saints' reign is (speaking generally) the scene on which the beast had reigned—the ten kingdoms.

2. And the method of the Divine jurisprudence points to the same conclusion. The wrath is *penal*—penal because of the wilful rejection of Christ. This is expressly affirmed in 2 Thess. i. 8: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that *obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" Manifestly such a penal visitation cannot come upon a nation like China, which has never as a nation rejected Christ, because it has never as a nation had Christ preached to it.*

The regions of the world not included in the scene of the apostasy become the scene of the great millennial conversion work. China, with its 300,000,000, India, with its 150,000,000,

* *Objec.*—Does not 2 Pet. iii. point to a *universal* conflagration? *Ans.* The object of the apostle there is not to intimate the territorial extent of the conflagration, but the certainty wherewith the wrath shall overtake the scoffers who are saying, Where is the promise of His coming? The presence of "scoffers," who say, "Where is the promise of His coming?" implies that the scene is one where Christianity has been proclaimed and rejected—an idea incompatible with the idea of a penal conflagration which should involve in its sweep nations such as China and India. At the same time this conflagration may afterwards extend to the other parts of the earth as penal, for the great and wide-spread apostasy which seems to await these other regions just previous to the final judgment.

Digitized by Google

not to speak of other and lesser peoples, are translated out of darkness into light.

The Jews gathered to their land during the troubles of the day of wrath, and now converted unto God (Zech. xii. 10—14; xiii. 1—3), become, it would seem, the missionaries of the Millennium. (Rom. xi. 15.) The "wild olive tree" (the Gentile Church), once graffed in among the natural branches (the Jews), has been cast away; for the Gentile Church (professing Christendom as a whole, distinguished from the Jewish Church) has not continued in God's goodness, and, therefore, it is cut off. (Rom. xi. 22.) And the natural branches (the Jews), no longer abiding in unbelief, have been graffed in again. (Ver. 24.) The Jew conducts the grand missionary enterprise of the millennium.

Hundreds, thousands, millions, are converted by the Spirit, now working with a power compared to which the pentecostal outpouring was as a mere sheaf to a whole harvest. That is the world's great harvest-home.

This great conversion-work, however, is not owing to the presence of Christ. The *Spirit* is the agent; for it is to Him exclusively that this office belongs. The Lord Jesus we believe will not be personally manifested during the millennium to any save to the glorified saints. We reject altogether the idea that conversions will be effected by any other agency than now, though they will be effected on a vastly grander scale.

IV. At the close of the millennium, Satan, bound at its beginning and during its currency, is again loosed for a little season. In the four quarters of the earth (Rev. xx. 8, *lit.*, "corners") he organizes a vast conspiracy, a last desperate onset against the woman's seed—Christ and his people. Those whom the millennial work has left unconverted, fall into his snare. A great multitude go up and compass the beloved city. (Ver. 9.) But suddenly the Lord personally and visibly interposes. The fire comes down from God out of heaven and devours them. (Ver. 9.) A new *manifestation* this rather than a new coming. He came premillennially *for* his saints; and to them—a distinct and separate community—he has manifested himself during the millennium. He comes postmillennially *with* his saints, they being associated with him now in the general judgment.

V. This is Satan's final discomfiture. He is taken and cast into the lake of fire, no more to come out. (Rev. xx. 8.) The seed of the woman bruises the head of the serpent.

Then takes place the second resurrection. (Ver. 12.) This

Digitized by Google

is a *general* resurrection; not a partial one, like the "first;" "The dead, small and great, stand before God." These "dead" include (1) all the wicked who had lived before the premillennial advent,—"the rest of the dead;" (2) the wicked whom the wrath—executed on the apostasy at that advent—overtook in their sins; and (3) all those, whether saints or wicked, who have died during the millennium or since its close (not including, of course, any of the saints who at the beginning of the millennium were raised or changed; for they cannot die).

Christ is here again personally present, for it is by Him that all bodily resurrection is effected, and by Him also judgment is executed. This, we repeat, is a new *manifestation* of Christ, rather than a new coming. The *coming*, strictly speaking, was at the beginning of the millennium. He came then *for* his saints,—He now comes, or is manifested, *with* them.

VI. The judgment proceeds, the saints who have been reigning with Christ during the millennium, acting as Christ's assessors in the work of judgment. (Matt. xix. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 2—3.) Whosoever is not found written in the Book of Life, is cast into the lake of fire. (Rev. xx. 15.) And all who are Christ's "are," as it is expressed in the Westminster Shorter Catechism, "made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity." Possibly at this general crisis the words of 2 Peter iii. may receive a more complete fulfilment than the partial conflagration at the fall of Antichrist accomplished. And more than possibly, it will be found that the Advent, instead of being limited, as some would have it, to the premillennial era, or limited, as others would have it, to the postmillennial era, has had a progressive development, —the last manifestation being the full efflorescence, whilst the former manifestation was its glorious presage and harbinger.

Such, as they appear to us, are the Bible teachings, respecting this world's future. Into the Scripture-details, warranting the successive positions, our space forbids us to enter. Only, for a few moments, we revert to the starting point,—"the first resurrection," and see what the Bible says on that point, and what objections occur. The other positions it is less necessary to examine more fully in detail. For with the first resurrection the others, we believe, stand or fall.

The question is,—Is "the first resurrection,"—which occurs confessedly at the beginning of the millennium,—spiritual or literal? In other words, is it a resurrection

Digitized by Google

of souls, *i.e.*, a conversion-work, or is it a resurrection of bodies? The one or the other it must be. The query is, which?

I. Try the former,—a spiritual resurrection or conversion-work. Does such an interpretation explain adequately the words of the Holy Spirit? The words are,—"They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

It is admitted that "resurrection" is often used in the Bible to signify a conversion-work. But has "resurrection" that meaning here? If it have, what follows?

1. All the conversions are at the beginning of the millennium, or at its close; none during its course. On this point, verse 5 seems quite express. Some of the spiritually dead are converted at the beginning of the millennium. The rest of the dead do not live again, till the thousand years are finished. These latter do live after the millennium has closed.

Now, it is generally believed, even by those who reject the premillennial advent, that the millennium will be ushered in by great judgments, not by a great conversion-work, and be followed also by a great outbreak of wickedness,—the millennium itself being the season of the conversion-work.

But this verse, if *spiritually* interpreted, asserts the very reverse. Conversion before the millennium actually begins; conversion after it has closed; but no conversion-work during its course. "The rest of the dead lived not again, till the thousand years were finished."

Suppose a literal resurrection, and the difficulty disappears. The righteous dead rise at the beginning of the millennium. The rest of the dead do not rise during the millennium. But at the close, they do rise.

2. If "the first resurrection" be spiritual, so also must be the second resurrection, mentioned at the close of the chapter. Either *both* must be a resurrection of *bodies*, or *both* must be a resurrection of *souls*. There is nothing whatever in the language to lead to the idea that different *kinds* of resurrection are meant. All that is intended, is to point out a distinction in point of *time*, and also that the *one* is *partial* and the *other* is *general*.

Digitized by Google

But will any one affirm that the resurrection at the close of the chapter is spiritual? Some have affirmed this, and, in affirming it, they have founded their main proof on the arguments used by those who affirm the first resurrection to be spiritual. The same class of arguments avail in both cases. For our own part, we shrink from a line of argument which would logically land us in holding the resurrection at the *close* of this chapter to be *spiritual*. Our friends shrink not less sensitively from the conclusion. But, unfortunately, in their zeal against a first resurrection of bodies, they apply to "the first resurrection" principles of interpretation which, if carried out to their logical conclusion, must lead to the denial of the literal nature of the second resurrection.

3. If "the first resurrection" be spiritual—if it mean a conversion-work, or revival—does not the language imply, that, previously to that revival, there has been no conversion-work, or revival worthy of the name? Else why is it called "the *first* resurrection?"

Is that the fact? Was Pentecost not a revival? Was not the Reformation a revival?

Objec. But the conversion-work during the millennium will be so much more glorious than any preceding conversion-work, that it may suitably be termed "the *first* resurrection." *Ans.* Be it remembered, however, that the conversion-work here supposed precedes the millennium—is suspended during the millennium, and is resumed and perfected after the millennium has closed.

Objec. But we do not mean the *first* revival in reference to the past, but only the first revival as distinguished from the second, which succeeds it. *Ans.* Well; but you deny that the second resurrection is a revival at all. *It*, you say, is a resurrection of bodies.

On the whole, as regards the idea that "the first resurrection" is spiritual, it must occur as very strange, that here, in this twentieth chapter of Revelation, where we have the only distinct and formal account (in the way of chronological order), which the Bible gives of what is to constitute the millennium, and of what is to follow it, and of what is to precede it—the spiritual revival or conversion-work, which is generally allowed to constitute the millennium's chief glory, should be exclusively either before the millennium or after the millennium—not at all during its course.

Objec. But do not we read elsewhere of a *simultaneous* resurrection of just and unjust, without any allusion to a first

Digitized by Google

resurrection—of saints? For example, do not we read, in John v. 28, "the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation"?

Ans. That is a strong passage,—perhaps the most plausible objection, at first sight, which can be urged from the Bible against a first and second resurrection. And we have put the objection in the strongest form. But let the reader carefully mark the passage, and the objection will disappear.

A parallel stated in ver. 25 will help us to the true meaning of ver. 28. "The hour is coming, and now is," said the Lord, in ver. 25, "when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." *That,* undoubtedly, is a resurrection of *souls*—a conversion-work. On this point there is no dispute. The words, "The hour is coming, and *now is*," prove that the work indicated in ver. 25 had already begun. But that work is still going forward. The "hour" or season of this resurrection, therefore, has lasted during 1800 years. And yet this resurrection is spoken of as simultaneous.

Now mark the light which this throws on ver. 28. The resurrection there spoken of is confessedly literal. Like the spiritual resurrection in ver. 25, it seems at first sight to be simultaneous. But the latter, we know, has, notwithstanding, occupied 1800 years since the time when the Lord uttered the words. Why may not the literal resurrection occupy, so far as this passage is concerned, an "hour" or season at least as long? If so, then there is room, in point of time, for a *first* resurrection at the beginning of the thousand years, and for a second resurrection at the close.

Objec. But in that case the literal resurrection is not *continuous,* as the spiritual resurrection is. *Ans.* Is that necessary? Would not a day of slaughter (as it has been said), the morning of which had witnessed one conflict, and the evening another, be still called a day of slaughter, though the interval were one of rest from conflict?

The truth is, it is not the *object* of this passage to announce the order of the resurrection at all. Its object is to announce the *certainty of the fact* that *all* shall one day *rise,* and shall *receive retribution according as they now receive or reject Christ Jesus.* Nothing can be more dangerous to a sound theology than to attempt to drag a Scripture text into an authority for a doctrine other than the doctrine which it is

Digitized by Google

the express purpose of that text to teach. The same remark applies to numerous other passages which have been abused in the same way as the present. For example, such a passage as that which speaks of the righteous and the wicked under the figure of "the sheep and the goats, the one on the right hand, and the other on the left;" where the *object* is to announce the *certainty of a just retribution*, and *not* the *order in point of time*. If this principle be carried out, post-millennialists will find it as hostile to their own views as they fancy it is to ours. Take a single illustration. They admit, we presume, that the saints shall judge the world—shall be associated with Christ in judging the wicked. If so, how does that comport with a *simultaneous* resurrection and judgment—with such an idea as that which they would force out of "the sheep and the goats?"

It is enough for us that all such passages be put out of court in the question as to settling the *order* of the resurrections. We look for the order only in the passages where it is the Spirit's object to teach that order. As to the others, it is sufficient if they can be shown to fall in with the order which the leading passages set forth.

II. If, then, the idea of a *revival* or *conversion-work* be incompatible with the terms in which Rev. xx. announces "the first resurrection," there remains only one other branch of the alternative—it must be *literal*—it must be a resurrection of *bodies*—a resurrection of the saints.

And let the reader note a few specimens of a considerable class of passages, which proceed on the supposition of a literal first resurrection, and which seem not explicable on any other theory. We name only the more prominent—such as we have ourselves been able to understand, only since we were led to admit a first resurrection.

1. Take Isa. xxv. 6—8. This passage, onward to the close of the chapter and also through the two chapters succeeding, describes the millennium. This all admit. A particular event is indicated in ver. 8, thus:—"He will swallow up death in victory." Plainly that event is introductory to the millennium,—certainly NOT *after the millennium is over*. The only question is, *What is the event so described?* Is it a spiritual revival? or is it a literal resurrection? The words as they here stand, and if left without further explanation, might, we think, mean either. But the words are explained elsewhere, and explained by the Holy

Digitized by Google

Ghost. In Cor. xv. 54, we read thus:—"So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'" Will any one affirm that "the saying" here quoted is not the saying in Isa. xxv. 8? or will any one affirm that the event recorded in 1 Cor xv., which that "saying" is declared to have prophetically announced, is not a *literal* resurrection? If not, is not the conclusion inevitable, that a literal resurrection is not wholly postponed till after the millennium is past? This falls in exactly with our view of Rev. xx. 4—6. Is it compatible at all with the spiritual view of that passage?

2. Take Dan. xii. 2:—"Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Calvin, and Thomas Scott, and all commentators of any name, consider this to be *literal* resurrection. But there is no hint of a millennium previous to it. On the contrary, it is immediately preceded, or rather is accompanied, by "the time of trouble." (Ver. 1.)

Objec. But may not that time of trouble be the outbreak intimated in Rev. xx. 8, 9 as occurring after the millennium? *Ans.* No; for the "time of trouble" in Dan. xii. 1, is connected in point of time with the downfall of Antichrist (xi. 4, 5). And Antichrist does not survive the millennium.

This premillennial resurrection is farther intimated in Dan. xii. 12, 13: "Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the end of the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. But go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." The period of 1335 days, or years, includes obviously the 1260 years of the dominion of Antichrist, and "predicts," (says Thomas Scott) "the complete introduction of the millennium." Well, at that time, at the end of the 1335 days—*i.e.*, at the beginning of the millennium, what happens? Daniel "stands in his lot"—*i.e.*, rises from the dead. Is not this a premillennial resurrection?

Objec. But does not ver. 2 speak of the resurrection as *general? Ans.* At first sight it looks so. But not really. The very words, "*Many* of them that sleep shall awake," show that *not all* then rise.

Objec. But some of the *wicked* dead seem to rise—"some to shame." *Ans.* Not so. The matter stands thus. The

Digitized by Google

dead here are divided into two classes. "*Many* rise;" *there* is the one class; *these* (rise) "to everlasting life." Others do not then rise;—*there* is the other class: *those* "to shame and everlasting contempt." The original words rendered "some" may just as correctly be rendered "these" and "those." The object of the passage is to announce that a part of the dead rise at that time,—that those so raised rise to everlasting life,—and that part of the dead, left behind in their graves, rise, when their time of resurrection comes, to shame and everlasting contempt.

3. Take Luke xiv. 14:—"Thou shalt be recompensed at *the resurrection of the just.*" The Jews, it is well known, looked for a resurrection of the just, or saints, at the Messiah's complete manifestation. The Lord alludes here to this belief, and sanctions it. They would understand Him as meaning a separate and special resurrection of saints. Had the idea been erroneous, the Lord would not have so spoken.

4. Take 1 Thess. iv. 16:—"The dead *in Christ* shall rise first." We do not quote this passage because the word "first" occurs in it; for that word refers, not to the saints as distinguished from the wicked, but to the dead saints, as distinguished from the saints who "are alive and remain," the former being raised at that day before the latter are changed. We quote it because of the *limitation* of the *persons raised.* It is not said "*the dead* shall rise first," but "the dead *in Christ.*" If *all* the dead rise at that time, why "the dead *in Christ?*" Does not this prove, or take for granted rather, a separate resurrection of saints?

5. Take Rev. xx. 6:—"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." Why "blessed and holy?" If it were a spiritual resurrection, why say this? Were it not a mere truism? But apply it to *literal* resurrection, and see its force. It contrasts with the second resurrection in which the *wicked* shall rise to everlasting *damnation:* "*Blessed* and *holy* is he that hath part in the first resurrection."

6. Take Phil. iii. 11:—"If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," or, as the original is, resurrection from among the dead (*ἐξαναστασιν την ἐκ νεκρων*). Paul could not have in his mind, when he wrote these words, the *general* resurrection; for to mere resurrection he would attain, whether he struggled on victoriously or not. He evidently was thinking of "the first resurrection"—the resurrection from among the dead (*την εκ νεκρων*—that one from

Digitized by Google

among the dead)—the resurrection of the saints—the resurrection of which it is said, "Blessed and holy is he that has part in it."

This leads us to remark, in conclusion, that, with Paul and with his fellow-warriors on the field of the Christian conflict, the hope of their Lord's return, and of the gathering together of the saints unto Him, was no vain unpractical theory, but their daily consolation and stimulating joy. They laboured, and endured, and hastened on, if by any means they might attain to this resurrection, and to the glorious reign which should follow.

Shall not the struggling Church be animated by a like hope now? The view presented in this article places us in the possibly immediate neighbourhood of the first resurrection. The "indignation" is at the door, which shall sweep away into the pit the Christ-rejecters, who, on the scene of the ten kingdoms, are sinning away so heinously their hour of grace. Further, a great and blessed conversion-work lies before the nations of Heathendom; and that work shall light up the millennial era with a glory compared with which all that human fancy has pictured of it shall fade into paleness. But, first and foremost, there await the martyr-company, who, whether in other days or in this age, have taken their place among the cross-bearers who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, the "first resurrection" joy, and the millennial reign. We know of no event which must necessarily intervene betwixt this hour and that blessed day. Therefore we feel that though the darkness deepens, we can calmly and hopefully lift up our heads, knowing that our redemption draweth nigh. The redemption is not anything merely personal or selfish—such a consummation, for example, as our own death could accomplish: it is a redemption which will instal in the purchased possession the whole martyr-company—which will cast the beast into the burning flame—which will bruise Satan under the feet of the woman's seed—which will end, upon the scene of the apostasy, the abominations which have so long defiled it—which will set the Father's King upon his holy hill of Sion—which will bring to the regions of Heathendom "life from the dead."

Surely there is nothing incredible in such a hope. It may not be the future which human fancies have imagined. But is it the future which the Bible declares?

We implore the reader who loves the Lord, not hastily or dogmatically to pronounce an adverse judgment, as if the

Digitized by Google

question were one which a passing sneer could consign into the category of "devout imaginations." The signs of the times are too portentous to enable the Church to advance much further in this darkening night without turning its eye to the "light shining in the dark place"—the sure word of prophecy. Why should brethren "fall out by the way," in seeking for the light which all so urgently need? Rather let each seek to help the other, in hastening forward to "the day of Christ." If one brother expect, earlier than does another, the "gathering together" unto the Elder Brother, why should that other think or utter hard things of him? Each is alike jealous of the honour of his Lord. Each alike shrinks from the thought of any carnal glory. The brother who looks for the speedy gathering together unto Christ, looks for a glory which shall admit into its holy territory only the saints who have been clothed with glorified bodies. Beyond the limits of that glorified company will go forward the millennial conversion-work. There is no carnal intermixture of the glorified with the unglorified. The two societies are separate and distinct. And then, when the millennial company shall have been gathered, they also shall, at the general resurrection, be glorified, and shall join the society who have been reigning with Christ during the thousand years. And so shall the one, united, glorified multitude be ever with their King, and reign for ever and ever.

Art. IV.—GENESIS.

Chapter III.

We have been looking at a perfect world. We have seen it to be such as God could call "good;" not a cloud in its sky, not a ruffle on its ocean-breadth, not a tinge upon its verdure, not a pang, or sigh, or groan, or tear, all over its bright plains. It is the dwelling of the unfallen, the outer chamber of heaven, the land wherein dwelleth righteousness. We have seen the *harmony* of creation; all its parts linked together in loving oneness, the animate and inanimate, the intelligent and irrational; no jar, no dissonance in any. Man is the head, the lord, appointed to exercise holy dominion under Jehovah as his head and lord. We have seen the *beauty* of creation, with its flowers and dew, its gems and gold, its sunshine and starlight above, its green stretch of hill, plain, forest, below. We have seen it as a world without a sin,

Digitized by Google

or a shadow, or a sigh, or a wrinkle; neither decay nor disease have entered it; there are no tossing sickbeds, no heart-breaking deathbeds, no severing bonds, no bitter farewells, no heaving tombs. It is a world altogether good; a world which angels might visit; over which God might delight, and in which he might dwell with man. We need not say of it, as has been done, "fit haunts of gods;" we may at once say, "Fit dwelling of Jehovah." A visible dwelling for the invisible God is that which was designed. This has always formed one special part of God's purpose in all its unfoldings.

We have now to learn the story of its change; its change from being the seat of life and righteousness and joy, to becoming the region of death and evil and sorrow; from being the dwelling of God, to becoming the haunt, nay, the regal residence of Satan, and the sphere of peculiar action to his hosts, "the rulers of the darkness of this world." From this chapter onwards to the twenty-first of Revelation we have the sad story of its sin. The two first chapters of Scripture tell of its unfallen glory, the two last of its restored perfection; but all between is gloom, a story of ruin and desolation—"written within and without with lamentation, and mourning, and woe." * We have seen a summer's sky overcast in an hour, the heavens putting on sackcloth, and the sun which had risen in calm going down in storm. So was it with our world, as this chapter proceeds to record; once holy, yet only for a day. How sudden and sad the change! Yesterday it was Paradise; to-day the wilderness. Yesterday it neighboured heaven; to-day it is the suburb of hell. Yesterday it was God's footstool; to-day it is Satan's throne. Yesterday it was linked to the sanctuary

* There is a curious old book of the sixteenth century, in quarto, with the following title:—"A Hyve full of Hunnye, contayning the firste booke of Moses, called Genesis, turned into English meetre," by William Hunnis. 1578. From the "argument" of this work we extract the following verses as a specimen. After describing creation he speaks of man:—

"Who viewing these his gracious gifts,
Should praise his holy name,
And magnify Him day and night,
Entirely for the same.
But man forgetting quite himself,
And God that rules on high,
Committed sin, displeased God,
And stumbled wittingly.
Who thro' his disobedience
Enthralled himself in woe,
And fell from God from whom to him
So many gifts did flow."

Digitized by Google

above by a bond that seemed everlasting; to-day that bond is broken, and it commences a swift descent into the uttermost darkness.

This third chapter records the manner in which this change was effected; the different steps which led to it. And here we have the *true* origin of evil—God's own account of the way in which tares were first sown in the field in which God had sown the finest of the wheat.

The passage takes for granted that there was already *an enemy* in existence. There had been *sin* before, *somewhere*, though *where* is not said. There had been an enemy somewhere; but how he had become so, or where he had hitherto dwelt, or how he had found his way to this world, is not recorded. That he knew about our world, and that he had some connexion with it is evident, though whether as its original possessor, or a stranger coming from far in search of spoil, we cannot discover. All that is implied in the narrative is, that there did exist an enemy—one who hated God, and who now sought to get vent to that hatred by undoing his handiwork.*

This enemy now makes his appearance. He has not been bound; he has not been prohibited entrance: he gets free scope to work. He shall be bound hereafter, when the times of restitution of all things commence, but not yet. He shall not be permitted to enter the "new earth," but he is allowed to enter and do his work of evil in the first earth. In order to deceive, and in order to prevent any suspicions arising, or any questions being put as to what he was, or whence he came, or what he sought, he takes the form of one of those animals with which man was surrounded; he selects that which possessed more intelligence than the rest,† not only to excite less suspicion, but probably

* "If creation is the first wonder of time, the second is the origin of that new element which extends through all generations, the entrance of evil into the pure creation, the defilement of that which was formed good, by the first sin. As the history of creation can possess complete truth, only where the idea of the Creator and the creature is a true one, so also can the history of the fall only where the idea of good and evil may be discovered in its true form, where the history proves itself to be true in its idea."—*Havernick, on the Pentateuch*, p. 100.

† "Quum instrumento opus haberet, delegit ex animalibus quod sibi aptissimum fore videbat."—*Calvin.* This expositor, after showing that the serpent was but "the mouth of the devil," goes on to consider the question why Moses does not explicitly state Satan's agency in this scene. He gives various reasons for this, such as "puerilis ecclesiæ ætas," &c. They do not satisfy. May not the true reason be just the very opposite of these suppositions? May it not be, that from the beginning men so

Digitized by Google

because, according to the nature of things, he could more easily and more fully take possession of it, and wield it more successfully as the instrument of his deception.

It is, however, only from other parts of Scripture that we directly learn who the real tempter was. It is simply said here,

Ver. 1.—"Now," (or and) "the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made."

This language is too simple to be allegorized or perverted. It obviously refers, in the first place, to the literal serpent.* This was the visible instrument through which the enemy spoke and acted. Nor is it a greater difficulty to suppose that Satan spoke to Eve through the wisest of animals, than that God spoke to Balaam through the stupidest, when he opened the ass's mouth to utter his message. The description here given is, as usual, of the matter just as it *appeared*.† It was the *serpent* that was seen and heard. It was the *serpent* that acted throughout, so far as Eve or Adam understood at the time. Hence it is the serpent alone that is mentioned. Yet that it was Satan assuming the disguise of a serpent, is evident. No mere animal could thus of itself reason of good and evil; could thus plot man's ruin, and show such hatred of God. Besides, the sentence afterwards pronounced on it *implies* this, just as the apostle's statement does.‡ (2 Cor. xi. 3. See also Rev. xii. 9—14; xv. 20—22.)

thoroughly understood the thing to be *Satan's* doing, that there was no need for using other language? The personality and agency of Satan were far better understood and realized in early days than in our own. Hence, not only all Jewish, but all Heathen traditions, while making mention of the serpent as helping in the origination of sin, introduce also along with him the evil spirit as the great agent. Serpent-worship was universal among the Heathen. (See Faber's "Horæ Mosaicæ," vol. i., p. 71, &c.)

* "Ille insatiabilis homicida....... non ursos, non leones, non fortia terræ animalia delegavit, sed tortuosum et callidum serpentem..... serpens non fortior erat sed callidior cunctis animantibus."—*Bernard, Serm. de Septem Spiritibus.* As Adam had just been naming the animals according to their natures, Eve would know that the serpent was more subtle or cunning than the rest. (See Lord Barrington's "Dissertation on the Temptation and Fall," p. 4.)

† "As Satan can change himself into an angel of light, so did he abuse the wisdom of the serpent to deceive man."—*Bishop's Bible.* The *original nature* of the serpent is evidently referred to as being "more subtle" than other animals. *Dathe's* idea, that it derives its characteristic from the *event*, and not from its *nature*, cannot stand with the words of Scripture. (See *Calvin* on this verse.)

‡ The plague of the fiery serpents seems to point to this, showing us the way of man's ruin by Satan, and the way of restoration by Christ.

Digitized by Google

Thus we learn, even at the outset, that God is not the author of sin. It is the creature that introduces it. God, no doubt, could have hindered it, but for wise ends he allows it. We know also how sin spreads itself. It is always *active*. It multiplies and propagates itself. Every fallen being becomes a tempter, seeking to ruin others,—to drag them down to the same death into which he has himself been driven.

Nor is it merely the upper orders of being that become snares or tempters. The lower parts of creation can be made instruments of ruin. God cannot tempt, but the creature does, in all its parts. The smallest, commonest thing—a leaf, a tree, an animal, may become Satan's instrument. Whatever can touch or affect any of our desires or feelings, may be made use of by Satan for our injury, just as the serpent was made use of here. How watchful ought we to be in such a world, where so many things minister to the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye. Flee sin,—flee its very shadow,—flee its most distant approach under any guise! Say not the temptation is a feeble one. That cannot be. The strength of the temptation lies in *yourself*, far more than in the tempting object. Get as far from sin and as near to God as you can—that is your only security. In God you are safe; but nowhere else. In Him who is God manifest in flesh, you are beyond the reach of danger. No tempter can succeed; no enemy can reach you there.

"And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" *

The angels fell *untempted*. Man's case was different. A

John iii. 14.) We may notice the other allusions to the serpent. 1. Its *bite* (Gen. xlix. 17; Jer. viii. 17; Prov. xxxiii. 32). 2. Its *tongue* (Ps. cxl. 3). 3. Its *voice* (Jer. xlvi. 23). 4. Its *poison* (Ps. lviii. 4). 5. Its *wisdom* (Matt. x. 26). 6. Its *hatefulness* (Matt. xxiii. 33). Such are the Scripture references. They preserve an awful uniformity throughout, presenting to us this one animal as pre-eminent above the rest for its evil qualities, and associating that one creature with Satan himself, with the introduction, propagation, and punishment of sin, giving us in it the emblem of sin's exceeding sinfulness, and of the ruinous results of contact, or connexion with it. See a very full collection of passages from the fathers relating to the serpent and his subtlety, in Suicer's "Thesaurus," vol. ii., p. 535—537. He thinks that *πανοῦργος* not *φρονιμος* (as the Seventy render it) is the proper translation, citing in proof the words of the apostle, "As the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning," (*πανουργια*,) 2 Cor. xi. 3. (See also *Bush's* long note upon the serpent in his "*Notes on Genesis*.")

* The use of "God" (Elohim) here and in what follows, instead of the Lord God (Jehovah Elohim), gives rise to the following striking

Digitized by Google

tempter ensnared him. That tempter took the form of a serpent. Hence he is named so specially, "that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan." (Rev. xx. 2.) He had himself fallen *untempted*, but this did not make him less willing to tempt. He had become the enemy of God, and thus became the enemy of man. A ruined being himself, he sought to ruin others, that so he might have companions in guilt and woe, and thus avenge himself upon God.

From the first clause regarding the serpent's *subtlety*, we are prepared for a well-laid plot, manifesting consummate art and guile.* The temptation will be well disguised; the snare will be well laid. The tempter must speak fair, if he hopes to succeed at all. He must veil *himself* as well as his object; for if he be recognised, or if his object be discovered, the victim will elude his grasp.

It is the *woman* that he assails, as being "the weaker vessel," † and therefore more likely to yield, and, in yielding, to draw the man with her. Then, as now (as, for example, in Popery ‡), he avails himself of woman's weakness and woman's influence.

He comes up to Eve, as one may suppose that a stranger

remark of Hengstenberg:—"The master-stroke of the tempter's policy was then, as it is still now, to change *Jehovah* into *Elohim*, the living, holy God into a *nescio quod numen*. (With what vagueness the term Elohim is used by the serpent, is shown by the expression, Ye shall be as Elohim, ye shall be raised to an unearthly nature and dignity.) Having done this, and not before, he could venture upon deluding them with a downright falsehood. Jehovah is not a man that he should lie. The woman should have employed the name Jehovah as an impenetrable shield to repel the fiery darts of the wicked one. The use of the name *Elohim* (that this was not from ignorance of the name Jehovah, is proved by ch. iv. 1) was the beginning of her fall. First, there was a depression or obscuration of the religious sentiment; then the tree appeared good to eat, and pleasant to the eye; God died in the soul, and sin became alive." —*On the Pentateuch*, vol. i., p. 317.

* "Magis metuendus est cum fallit quam cum sævit," says Augustine. (On Ps. xl.) This will remind the reader of Rutherford's well-known remark, "Brother, since we must have a devil to trouble us, I love a *raging* devil best." Hence the apostle speaks of the "wiles of the devil;" and hence the serpent seems to have been fixed on by God as the animal of all others fitted to set forth Satan's characteristic,—deadly cunning. The violence of the "roaring lion" is subordinate to this.

† *ασθενεστερον σκευος*,—weaker than the man,—less capable of resistance. "*Imbecilla res est fœmina*," says Quintilian; and Hilary speaks of "*sexus mollioris*."—*Comment. on Matthew*.

‡ For striking illustrations of this, see "The Secret Instructions of the Jesuits," and Michelet's "Priests, Women, and Families." Satan, through the priest, does now to the daughters of Eve, what, through the serpent, he did to Eve herself.

Digitized by Google

might do, seeking information. He feigns to be one who has just heard a rumour that has greatly surprised him,—a rumour which he cannot credit, so insulting does he deem it to God's character, so injurious and unkind to man.* It is evident that he had heard God's prohibition. *How*, we know not; but we see here that he has access to learn what is taking place amongst us. He can hear and see the things that we hear and see! He is on the watch to gather them up,—ever listening, ever looking, ever following us, that he may discover alike what we say to God, and what God says to us. At one time he is the beguiling serpent, at another the devouring lion, but always "going about,"—"walking to and fro throughout the earth," to learn what may serve his purpose of malice towards man and revenge against God.

With well-feigned surprise and incredulity, he puts the question, "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" meaning thereby to insinuate the harshness of the injunction which he pretended hardly to believe.† Is it possible that God can have said so? Is it conceivable that He who has just made you, and provided you with such abundance, should grudge you a little fragment of that plenty, and debar you from the garden's choicest fruits; making you lords of creation, yet not allowing you to put forth your lordship, nay, refusing you access to that tree, the fruit of which would enable you rightly to exercise wise dominion?‡ In this his object was to calumniate God,—at least, cunningly to suggest an idea which would misrepresent his character to man. He keeps out of sight all that God had done for man, all the proofs of love, so manifold, so vast; he fixes on one thing which *seemed* incon-

* "The devil feigneth that he believeth God had wholly forbidden them the use of the fruits of the garden, to make way to talk with the woman, and to induce her to give ear to him."—*Diodati.*

† The Jewish rabbis affirm that this is but the conclusion of a long conversation held between the woman and the serpent. *Bush* remarks, "the probability is, that this was not the commencement of his discourse, but that something, which the historian does not record, had been previously said." The words are, literally, "Yea, surely, has God said?" *Mercer* translates them, "Itane verum est eum dixisse;" *Calvin*, "Etiamne dixit Deus?" See *Rungius* also.

‡ Some have thought that Satan really began with a *lie;* insinuating that God had forbidden them the use of *every* tree of the garden. The woman's answer does seem to confirm this; only it is more likely that Satan took advantage of a *truth*, in order to misconstrue it, than that he framed a *lie*, which could be at once denied and disproved.

Digitized by Google

sistent with this; he brings up this before man in the way most likely to awaken evil thoughts of God.* Not as if *he* wished to say one word against God, nor even as if he needed to say anything; but as if the thing itself were too plain to be mistaken,—as if, on the supposition of its being true, it could admit but of one interpretation. He leaves the fact to speak for itself. His object is to isolate the one fact, and so to separate it from all God's acts of love as to make it appear an instance of harsh and unreasonable severity.† Man had hitherto known the prohibition; but he had put no such construction on it; he had not imagined it capable of being so interpreted. Now Satan brings it up, and sets it out in an aspect likely to suggest such constructions as these:—"God is not your friend after all; He but pretends to care for you. He is a hard master, interfering with your liberty, not leaving you a free agent, but constraining you, nay, fettering you. He mocks you, making you creation's head, yet setting arbitrary limits to your rule, placing you in a fair garden, yet debarring you from its fruits. He grudges you his gifts, making a show of liberality, while withholding what is really valuable."

Thus Satan sought to calumniate God, to malign his character, to represent him as the enemy, not the friend, of man. If he can succeed in this, then man will begin to entertain hard thoughts of God—then he will become alienated from him; then he will disobey; and then come the fall, the ruin, the guilt, the doom, the woe! Man is lost! Hell gets another inmate. The devil gets another companion. God's second work is marred, and he himself is left to grieve over his new-made child torn from his embrace. In this way Satan thrusts in the wedge between man and God

* "He begins by calling in question the *truth* of God. Is it true that God has prohibited any tree? Can it be? For what was it created? Such are the inquiries of wicked men to this day. 'For what are the objects of pleasure made,' say they, 'but to be enjoyed?' We might answer, among other things, 'to try them that dwell on the earth.'" (*Fuller, on the place.*) Calvin suggests the same idea: "*Mulieri scrupulum injicere voluit ut verbum Dei non esse crederet, cujus non palam extabat plausibilis ratio.*" He hints also at another shade of meaning: "Can your eating or not eating of a tree be of any concern to God; do you think He would take the trouble of forbidding you?"

† "It seems to contain an insinuation that, if man must not eat of *every tree*, he might as well eat of none. Thus discontent overlooks the good, and pores upon the one thing wanting. 'All this availeth me nothing, so long as Mordecai is at the gate.'"—*Fuller, on the place.*

Digitized by Google

—breaks the link between the creature and the Creator. How simple yet how successful the process! * A single question is put. God's character is maligned. The lie is believed. Man suspects God and perishes! Such is the dark process still by which Satan seeks to hinder our return to God. His aim is to misrepresent God to man—to prove God to be unkind in what he has prohibited and a liar in what he has declared. The Gospel is the full representation of God's gracious character made known by God himself that the sinner may be induced to return. Satan perverts it or says it is untrue. Man believes the tempter, stands afar off, and dies!

Ver. 2.—"And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat (or, we shall eat) of the fruit of the trees of the garden. 3. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die."

Had the woman fully understood the wicked suggestion of the serpent, or had she seen who it was that was speaking to her under the guise of the serpent, she would perhaps have fled at once. But not fully realizing either, and wishing perhaps to vindicate God for imposing, and herself for submitting to, such a restriction, she stood still to reason with the tempter. To a certain extent she was not so inexcusably guilty in this thing as we are in parleying with Satan instead of resisting him at once and placing God's armour between us and his assaults; still there was enough to leave her without excuse. Even though she might not fathom the malignity of the suggestion, still it touched the question of obedience or disobedience to God, and this she ought at once to have resented and flung off with abhorrence.

Yet she does not yield at once. On the contrary, she defends her position. She makes ready mention of God's kindness and wide liberality, reminding the tempter that

* "Fallax diabolus et ad traducendum artifex calidissimus," says Hilary (on Matthew); and again (on Psalm cxli.), "quicquid iniquitatum homines gerunt a diabolo suggeritur." Thus it is that the fathers speak of Satan. They always seem to see him and to contend with him hand to hand. He is always personal to them—their great enemy; no mere figure or personification of the evil principle, but a living agent of perilous power and craft. In their days men calling themselves Christians had not learned to speak of "extinct Satans." Chrysologus has a singular passage, setting forth the evil agency of Satan. We can only quote part:—"Diabolus mali auctor, nequitiæ origo, rerum hostis, secundi hominis semper inimicus; ille laqueos tendit, lapsus parat, foveas fodit, aptat ruinas, stimulat corpora, purgit animas," &c., &c.—*Sermon* xi., *on Christ's Fasting and Temptation*.

Digitized by Google

there was but one tree forbidden, and that all the rest were free for use.

Still she alters the words of the prohibition, and in this we see her beginning to waver. The change may be a slight one, yet we cannot help thinking that there is a meaning in it. She *adds* to it, for God had not said, "Neither shall ye touch it;" she *takes from* it, for she greatly softens the threat, making it not "thou shalt surely die," but "lest ye die."* She thus exaggerates the restriction, as if wishing to prove it to be a hardship, and she dilutes the penalty, or at least the awfulness of its certainty, as if trying to persuade herself that it was not quite such a certainty as she had once thought it. Thus does sin work still. It magnifies God's prohibitions into hardships, in order to find an excuse for disobedience, and then it tries to underrate both the certainty and the greatness of the penalty. Simple obedience is what man does not like. Simple acquiescence in God's commands is what he is slow to learn. He altered God's words in order to get an excuse for departing from God, and so he still alters "the word of the truth of the Gospel" for the purpose of excusing himself for not returning at once to God and taking advantage of the free welcome of his abundant grace.

Ver. 4.—"And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die.† 5. For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods (*or, as God*) knowing good and evil."

The tempter immediately catches up the words of the woman, in which she had spoken of death as being the penalty of eating. Professing to act as her friend,‡ he speaks as one attempting to undeceive her as to a mistake under which she was labouring. "You speak of the tree as dangerous to eat or even to touch; nay, as involving the penalty of death to the eater. You have been quite deceived in this

* Calvin does not admit the former alteration to be an indication of apostasy already begun, but he contends for the latter being so. He thinks that she was overlooking the penalty, or at least its certain infliction: "Mortis periculum procul et frigide sentire se demonstrat." *Bernard* has brought out the same sense: "Ista (Eva) sub dubio supponit, ne forte, inquiens, si comederimus moriamur." And again: "Deus affirmat, mulier dubitat, Satan negat."—*Sermones.*

† Coverdale's translation is very expressive: "Tush, ye shall not die the death." An old writer notices that the devil says *ye*, not *thou*, having his eye on Adam as well as Eve.

‡ One of the Fathers remarks, "Diabolus plures decipit blanditiis quam terroribus."

Digitized by Google

matter; there is no such deadly penalty; it is a mere threat on the part of God to prevent you eating of a tree which he knows would open your eyes and make you as himself, knowing good and evil."*

Thus he proceeds with his design of calumniating God and questioning his veracity as well as his goodness. He goes a step further than in his former suggestion. He openly denies the *certainty* of the threatened penalty; he questions its reality, and casts suspicion on God's intention in announcing it. Nay, more than this, he goes on to affirm that God knew well that instead of a curse there would come a blessing from the tasting of the tree, and that it was because he was jealous of man—envious of the blessing thus to be reached—that he had shut him out from the tree. Thus he insinuates that God was a being of mere craft and falsehood, bearing no kindly feeling towards man, standing between him and a treasure-house of boundless blessing.

In this answer to the woman he speaks as one conscious that he was *making way*. He sees from *her answer* that he has made an impression by his indirect suggestion; and he now follows it up by something bolder and more direct.† "Ye shall not surely die!" God neither can nor will execute his threat. Do not be alarmed. Do not let a mere fancy hinder you reaching out after such blessings as lie before you. So says Satan to the sinner still. "There is no hell; the second death is a mere dream; eat, drink, and be

* "Knowing good and evil." To know good and evil is sometimes a general expression for knowing *everything*, just as not to know good or evil is the expression for total ignorance,—the ignorance of infancy. (Deut. i. 39.) Or the expression may refer to "sitting in judgment on good and evil;" as in Eccles. viii. 5, "A wise man's heart discerneth (knoweth) both time and judgment;" and in 2 Sam. xiv. 17, "As an angel of God so is my Lord the king to discern (hear) good and bad;" and 1 Kings iii. 9, Solomon prays for a heart to "discern between good and bad." The temptation then would be that they should be as God in *judging*, sitting on his judgment-seat. In the world as it stood they were only to be rulers of what God had pronounced "good:" they are tempted to seek to be judges of "evil"—to enter on a new domain both of rule and of judgment. Into this new region they sought to be introduced, not in God's time or way; and hence they found it only a region of shame and darkness. But the time is coming when we shall possess it in a different way—the way of faith and obedience—the obedience of him who "grew in wisdom," waiting God's time for filling him with knowledge; not like the first Adam, snatching at it impatiently. Then we shall "judge all things;" we shall "judge the world;" we shall "judge angels."

† "Nemo cum serpente securus ludit, nemo cum diabolo jocatur impune."—*Chrysologus Serm.*, 155.

Digitized by Google

merry; sin as you like and don't fear punishment." Thus he beguiles the soul, and leads it onward to the second death. Strange that men should believe him,—that they should listen to his voice in preference to God's. They *want* to be persuaded, and so they are persuaded; they want to be deceived, and so they are deceived! Yet can all this deception quench the flame of the burning lake, or set aside death, or make the wrath of God less true or terrible? Let him say there are no diseases, no pains, no sicknesses, *now*, would men believe him? No. And will they believe him when he tells them, there is no death *hereafter*?

"Your eyes shall be opened." They shall be opened by that very act which you so much shrink from. It is God who is keeping them closed. He is drawing a curtain round you, excluding you from visions of brightness on every side. What a prospect spreads round you! A little boldness in disobedience, and all this fair region shall be yours as it is already mine.

"Ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil." No lower level than that of God Himself shall you rise to. All his height of honour shall be yours. Nay more, all his *knowledge*. Ye shall know, and judge, and see, even as He knows, judges, and sees. From all this wide circle of knowledge God is shutting you out. He wants the throne wholly to Himself; He cannot bear a rival.

Thus Satan sowed the seeds of mistrust, unbelief, atheism, hatred of God. Thus the "evil heart of unbelief" was produced, and separation from God was the immediate result. It is thus that he still keeps the sinner at a distance from God, and prevents his "submitting to the righteousness of God." He sows and waters the seed of dark distrust in the sinner's soul, by persuading him that God is not sincere either in his wrath or in his grace. He leads the sinner to exalt, nay to deify himself, to think so highly of himself that he will not consent to God's terms at all. And hence the first thing that the Spirit does to a man is to *make him stoop*, by convincing him of sin, and bringing him to forget all his ideas of self-deification. Then he is glad of another's righteousness, and takes it eagerly. But till then, he will not take even heaven itself on God's terms. He looks on God as his enemy; or at least as not so entirely his friend that He will at once receive him and bless him as he is. Strange that it should be so now! Whatever our first parents might plead in excuse we are inexcusable. God's gift of his Son,—the cross, the death, the grave of that Son,—have all unfolded in its fullest breadth the

Digitized by Google

love of God, proving that he is the sinner's true and real friend. Yet who believes this? How few take God's word concerning this and enter into peace and friendship!

Nay, more than this, Satan tells us that *sin* is a blessing, not a curse; that its consequences are good, not evil; and under this aspect the sinner pursues it. He sees in the command not to sin, a restriction of his liberty, and he spurns it! He sees in sin itself the attainment of what is pleasant, and he pursues it. What is sweet in sin is *present*, what is bitter is *future*, so he drinks the cup, and bids the future care for itself. Yet that future involves in it the favour of Jehovah Himself, and the joys of an eternal heaven. Is he prepared to say that that favour is a mere dream and the loss of it a trifle? Is he prepared to say that there is no heaven as well as no hell,—no joy as well as no sorrow for eternity?

Ver. 6.—"And when (*when* is not in the Hebrew) the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes (*Heb.* a desire to the eyes), and a tree to be desired to make one wise* (*Heb.* to cause to understand), she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat."

The tempter has now thrown a new and peculiar interest round the tree. He has rivetted the woman's eye upon it, and what shall hinder her heart from following her eye? She had stood still to reason with him. This was her first false step. She now stood still to gaze upon the object reasoned about, and to wonder why she should be shut off from it. He had thus succeeded in fixing her eye on the tree; he had succeeded in shaking her belief as to the penalty; and now what remained but that she should wholly yield? Nay, is she not already overcome? The fascination becomes stronger and stronger. She lets it carry her unresistingly along. She consults neither her husband nor her God. She hurries into the commission of the sin.†

There were three things that wrought upon her.

1. *The tree was good for food.* A strong reason, had she

* "Pleasant to the eyes,"—*Vulg.* pulchrum oculis. *Sept.* ἀρεστον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. *Coverdale,* "lustye unto the eyes." The word means delight or pleasure; and refers here to something that the eye delights in. "To be desired to make one wise." This is a still stronger word; "flagrantius appetendus," says Robertson. This author derives the word "to make wise" from one signifying "to ripen," implying that the meaning in the present passage is "to bring to maturity in knowledge."

† Though it is evident that she consulted not with Adam, yet the word "with her" would lead us to suppose that he was present or within sight. Calvin gives reasons against this; but they are very slight. The Jewish writers seem to have believed that he was with her at the time.

Digitized by Google

been famishing, but none when surrounded with the plenty of the rich garden. Strange that she should have cared for it on such an account! She is in no need for food, yet it is on this account that she covets it! She is without excuse in her sin. It was the lust of the flesh that was at work. (Eph. ii. 3; 1 John ii. 16.) She saw in the tree the gratification of that lust, and in God a hinderer of it. Thus she fell.

2. *It was a desire of the eyes.* And had she no other objects of beauty to gaze upon? Yes: thousands. Yet this forbidden one engrossed her, as if it had acquired new beauty by having been prohibited. Or can she not be satisfied with *looking?* Must she *covet?* Must she touch and taste? It is plain that hers was no longer the natural and lawful admiration of a fair object, but an unlawful desire to possess what she admired.* It was "the lust of the eye." Job understood this, and "made a covenant with his eyes" (xxxi. 1); David knew it, and prayed, "Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity."

3. *It was a tree to be desired for imparting wisdom.* This was the crowning allurement. She must have wisdom, and she must have it at all risks, and she must have it without delay. She made haste to be wise. She would not in faith wait for God's time and way of giving wisdom. So strong was the craving for knowledge, and so strangely did the divine prohibition sharpen the appetite for it! She could not but know that nothing would be withheld from her that was really good; that she would get all knowledge in due time, and in God's own way; but her confidence in God had wavered; she could no longer trust Him for this; she was in haste to be wise; and now that all wisdom was within her reach, she can no longer wait. Such was the desire (or lust) of the mind! (Eph. ii. 3.)

These three reasons prevailed. She plucked the fruit, and did eat. Nay, more, she gave also to her husband, who was

* Jerome will have it that we are not even to gaze upon what we may not desire, "*Intueri non debet quod non licet concupisci.*" (*On Jerem.*) This is too much. It is ascetic rigidity, making restrictions where God has made none. *Admiring* and *coveting* are two very different things. When reading such remarks, we cannot help believing that we find the prototype of them all in Eve's "neither shall ye *touch* it." Jerome, however, adds truly, "Neque enim Eva lignum vetitum contigisset nisi hoc prius *incaute* respiceret." And then he remarks, "Hinc ergo pensandum est quanto debemus moderamine erga illicita visum restringere, nos qui mortaliter vivimus, si et mater viventium per oculos ad mortem venit. . . concupiscendo visibilia, invisibiles virtutes amisit." Peter Chrysologus has some good remarks on the passage before us, compared with Mark ix. 47, "If thine eye offend thee."—*Sermon* xxvii.

Digitized by Google

with her, and he did eat. She was not content to sin alone. Even the dearest on earth must be drawn into the same snare.

Let us mark here such lessons as the following :—

1. The danger of trifling with objects of temptation. To linger near them; to hesitate about leaving them; to think of them as harmless,—these are the sure forerunners of a fall. Beware of remaining within sight. Get beyond the circle of the spell. "Flee youthful lusts." "Look not on the wine when it is red." (Prov. xxiii. 31.) Your only safety is in instant flight. If the tempter can get you to *look*, he has secured his victory.*

2. The three sources of temptation: the lust of the flesh, of the eye, of the mind. Strictly speaking, they are not in themselves sinful, but in their excess, or disorderly indulgence. There is no sin in relishing food, nor in looking at a fair object, nor in desiring knowledge; yet through these channels our temptations come. Things lawful in themselves are our most subtle seducers.† There is nothing to taint the ear in "the concord of sweet sounds;" and yet how often does music become our wiliest tempter? There may be nothing to defile the eye in the fairest imitations of nature that art has ever flung upon her canvas; yet has not painting but too frequently ensnared the soul, and drawn it away from the Creator to the creature? What is there in the widest range of science that can be branded as evil; yet do we not see it in the present day supplanting the knowledge of God himself, and used by Satan as his mightiest instrument for leading men captive at his will? Is not poetry the highest form of word and thought; yet man has corrupted it into the utterance of his own wild passions, or the idle breathings of his fond affections. In the scenes of nature there is nought but what is good, and fair, and bright; yet these has man made use of to shut out God, either saying, with the Atheist, "There is no God in nature;" or maintaining, with the Pantheist, that nature itself is divine.

3. The swift progress of temptation. She listened, looked, took, ate!‡ These were the steps. All linked

* Hence Augustine adduces the temptation and fall of our first parents as a warning against the wiles of the serpent. "Ille (Adam) cecidit ut nos surgamus."—*On Psalm* xlviii.

† "Fallimur oculis, decipimur auditu, capimur odore, et sapore vitiamur."—*Chrysologus*, Sermon xxvii.

‡ "Creditus est serpens, contemptus est Deus; tactum est vetitum, mortuus est homo."—*Augustine* on Psalm lxxiv.

Digitized by Google

together and swiftly following each other. The beginning how small and simple; the end how terrible! "When lust (desire) hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." (Jas. i. 15.) And, therefore, adds the apostle, "Do not ERR,* my beloved brethren;" that is, do not turn aside one step out of the right way, as you know not where you may end. You begin with a *look*, you end in apostasy from God. You begin with a touch, you end in woe and shame. You begin with a thought, you end in the second death. Yet of all these steps God protests solemnly that he is not the author. (Jas. i. 13.) It is *man*, that is his own ensnarer and destroyer. Even Satan cannot succeed unless seconded by man himself.

4. The tendency of sin to propagate itself. No sooner has the tempted one yielded than he seeks to draw others into the snare. He must drag down his fellows with him. There seems an awful *vitality* about sin; a fertility in reproduction, nay, a horrid necessity of nature for self-diffusion. It never lies dormant. It never loses its power of propagation. Let it be the smallest conceivable, it possesses the same terrific diffusiveness. Like the invisible seeds that float through our atmosphere, it takes wing the moment it comes into being, flying abroad, and striking root everywhere, and becoming the parent of ten thousand others.

Ver. 7.—"And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves aprons." †

Their eyes were opened! They in that moment saw things which they saw not and could not have seen before. They saw into a new region, but that region was a sad and dark one. Their eyes were opened, and they seemed as if suddenly placed before a mirror, for the first object that met their view was—THEMSELVES.‡ And the first thing that

* μὴ πλανᾶσθε, "do not go astray;" do not let temptation allure you one step out of the way. This word is used eight times in the Apocalypse in connexion with Satan and his seductions.

† "Sewed" is too strong and definite a word; it is simply "wrought or fastened together." (See Rosenmuller, who, quoting Gatacker and the Syriac, affirms that it means, properly, *applicare*, *complicare*, *aptare*.)

‡ We all know something of this "opening of the eye" immediately on the commission of an act of sin. Up to the moment of the commission we are blind to the sin and its consequences. The moment it is done a strange feeling seizes us, we become aware of the sin, conscience stirs, and we wish the deed undone. In addition to this, however, there might be something in the actual tree affecting the moral nature, and stimulating conscience.

Digitized by Google

struck and startled them about themselves, was their nakedness! They were naked before, but nakedness had brought with it no sense of shame. But the moment they disobeyed, the consciousness of being *unfit to be seen* arose within them. Formerly, all parts of their body were "comely;" now certain parts became "uncomely." (1 Cor. xii. 23.) Just as certain animals were afterwards set aside as unclean, so were certain parts of man's body, that there might be about man the perpetual token and remembrance of sin. It would seem as if when Adam ate of the fruit, the grosser passions of his nature were let loose, and rose into mastery. All parts of his nature had hitherto been in equal and harmonious proportions; now the flesh rose up, and sin revealed shame. As in the case of bodily disease the general *virus* which may be pervading the whole frame fastens or settles down upon some special part, so was it in the case of the moral poison which now shot through the whole man, in consequence of that fatal act of disobedience.

A sense of shame either in regard to soul or body is not natural. It does not belong to the unfallen. It is the fruit of sin. The sinner's first feeling is, "I am not fit for God, or man, or angels, to look upon." Hence the essence of confession is, *being ashamed* of ourselves. We are made to feel two things—first, a sense of condemnation; and secondly, a sense of shame; we are unfit to receive God's favour, and unfit to appear in his presence. Hence Job said, "I am vile;" and hence Ezra said, "I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God." (ix. 6.) Hence also Jeremiah describes the stout-hearted Jews, "they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush." (vi. 15.) Hence Solomon's reference to the "impudent face" of the strange woman (Prov. vii. 13), and Jeremiah's description of Israel, "Thou hadst a whore's forehead, thou refusedst to be ashamed." (iii. 3.) It was the *shame* of our sin that Christ bore upon the cross; and, therefore, it is said of Him that He "despised the shame." It was laid upon Him, and He shrunk not from it. He felt it, yet He hid not his face from it. He was the well-beloved of the Father, yet He hung upon the tree as one unfit for God to look upon,—fit only to be cast out from his presence. He took our place of shame that we might be permitted to take his place of honour. In giving credit to God's record concerning Him we are identified with Him as our representative; our shame passes over to Him, and his glory becomes ours for ever.

It was this sense of shame that led Adam and Eve to have

Digitized by Google

recourse to fig-leaves for a covering. Suddenly possessed with the awful thought that they were unfit to be seen, even by each other, they eagerly betook themselves to the first thing that lay within their reach, glad to get hold of anything which would hide them from each other's eyes, or prevent that strange feeling of shame which had thus arisen.

It is to the *eye* that the sense of shame appeals, and it is only in the *light* that its appeal can be made good. To prevent this appeal the sinner seeks the *darkness*, and hence it is that deeds of shame and deeds of darkness are the same in import. Hence it is also that our Lord speaks of men hating the light and loving the darkness because their deeds are evil. But whether it is to fig-leaves or to darkness that the sinner betakes himself, the feeling that leads to the act is the same. His object is to get where no eye can see him. He forgets the eye above, that can look through every human covering; and hence, as Adam tried his fig-leaves, so he tries his good deeds, his prayers, and his repentance, forgetful that the eye of flame (Rev. ii. 18) can look through them. The covering he needs is one which will hide from the eye that is *Divine*. He learns this when the Holy Spirit begins his work of conviction in him. For then it is as if God's eye of awful holiness were piercing through his coverings and flashing through the darkness in which he had wrapt himself. Then he learns that the covering he needs must be *divine*. It must be as divine as that eye which is looking into him from above. It must be something which will hide his shame even from the eye of God; something that will do for him not merely in the darkness or the twilight, but under the brilliance of a cloudless noon.

What is it but this same consciousness of shame that leads man to resort to *ornaments?* These are intended by them to compensate for the shame or the deformity under which they are lying. They feel that shame belongs to them; nay, confusion of face. They feel that they are not now "perfect in beauty," as once they were. Hence they resort to ornament in order to make up for this. They deck themselves with jewels that their deformity may be turned into beauty. But there is danger here—danger against which the apostle warns us, specially the female sex. (1 Pet. iii. 3, 4.) There is nothing indeed innately sinful in the gold, or the silver, or the gems which have been wrought by the skill of men into such forms of brightness. But in our present state they do not *suit* us. They are unmeet for sinners. They speak of pride, and they also minister to pride. They are for the kingdom,

Digitized by Google

not for the desert. They are for the city of the glorified, not for the tent of the stranger. They will come in due time, and they will be brilliant enough to compensate for the shame of earth. But we cannot be trusted with them now.*

* We add the following extract from a work already quoted, which helps to illustrate the whole passage over which we have gone:—

"Those who are so averse to admit the figurative language of Scripture, are puzzled extremely to account for the vehicle of Satan's first temptation —*a serpent*. Let such writers and readers as feel so disposed, amuse themselves with answering the cavils of critics, and the sneers of fools on this subject; it shall be our province to attempt a plain and scriptural investigation of it. We have already stated that it appears the situation of Adam in Paradise corresponds with our situation now; he lived by a commandment, as we do; for 'this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of the only-begotten Son of God,' who is the true *tree of life*. In like manner we observe, that there is nothing uncommon, nothing contrary to what is daily experienced in the first temptation; otherwise Paul was wrong to say, 'But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve, through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.' (2 Cor. xi. 3.) As the serpent is characteristic of guile, subtlety, and deceit, so his form was assumed by Satan, as his character daily is by the tempter, corrupting the truth of the Gospel. God had placed our first parents in Paradise, setting before them life from the tree of life, and death from the tree of knowledge. There are no proofs mentioned as adduced, simply the *Divine Word*, as to these trees. Satan, by the serpent, reasoned their minds out of the belief of the simple truth God had set before them. And he gradually persuaded them, not only that they should *not* die from eating the tree of knowledge, but that the brightest happiness, and most perfect attainments, would infallibly ensue. So is it at this hour—the Gospel sets the tree of life before us, as connected with present and future bliss—the tempter sets this world, and assures us that everything gratifying to man is to be found in it, while certain death is by no means the penalty. In every age and nation, Satan's temptation has had the same object—we had almost said the same language. Believing this father of liars, as we are all most prone to do—persuading herself that every gratification would follow—Eve ate and gave her husband, who partook in her transgression, and became subject to the same penalty. Their conduct under the impressions of guilt was the same as in all future ages: their eyes were opened; they found themselves naked and exposed to shame and everlasting disgrace; they therefore betook themselves to the only frail covering they could devise—fig-leaves."—*Morrison's Key to the Pentateuch.*

Digitized by Google

Notes on Scripture.

NOTES ON THE PSALMS.

Psalm LI.

We saw a series of considerable length concluded in Psalm l. The Psalm before us stands in an isolated position. It is not part of any series. It has a peculiarity that no previous Psalm has exhibited, for it is written (and the Hebrew title authenticates the fact) on occasion of David's adultery, and his detestable attempts to hide his adultery by murder of the basest kind. Now no such circumstances as these could ever have in them aught that corresponded in the remotest manner to any circumstances in the life of the Surety, David's Son. On the contrary, so far is this Psalm from being fitted to express the work of the Surety, that it seems introduced at this point in order to lead us to look back on the former songs of David, and to say of what was set forth therein, "Surely *this* David, who here appears as a leper all over, with a heart as vile as the worst action of his life, cannot be *the* David of whom such glorious things were spoken?" Viewed in this light, the Psalm before us is fitted to direct us to the true David, as He of whom the lofty things of preceding Psalms were sung.

Coming, as this Psalm does, close upon one which set the *principles of judgment* before us, it is not uninteresting to observe that it falls into its place very appropriately. For here we find a sinner—an individual sinner—realizing his position at that bar, and consenting to the decisions of a tribunal whereat nothing but justice has free course. The sinner acknowledges in ver. 4 that his sin is all his own, and done in direct opposition to the Holy One; and he owns his folly before all the universe.

> "That thou mayest be justified in the matter of the law proclaimed by thee,
> And be clear in regard to the judgment pronounced by thee on the lawbreaker."

He finds nothing in the terms of the law too strict, nor aught in the penalty annexed too severe. The use of דָּבְרֶךָ may be a reference to Exod. xx. 1, where the Ten Commandments are called הַדְּבָרִים.

The plan of the Psalm seems to be as follows:—It is as if God had printed the diary of David, and, in order to humble him, handed it to the "*chief musician,*" that all Israel might know his bitter repentance, and might say, in substance, what Augustine writes, "*Non ergo cadendi exemplum propositum est, sed si cecideris resurgendi. Tu hoc amas in David, quod in se odit David?*"

Digitized by Google

Deep groans for pardoning mercy, from the pit of pollution. (Vers. 1, 2.)
Confession of sin and acknowledgment of the Lord's righteous law. (Vers. 3, 4.)
An awful gaze upon the source of all actual sin. (Ver. 5.)
Deliverance from falsehood, folly, and guilt, must come from God alone. (Vers. 6, 7.)
The voice of a reconciled God heard again. (Ver. 8.)
On the foundation of thorough forgiveness prayer is made for thorough holiness. (Vers. 9, 10.)
Not temporary holiness any more than temporary forgiveness. (Ver. 11.)
The joy of full salvation (*i.e.*, of both pardon and holiness) is sought as the true and natural furnishing or equipment for future usefulness. (Ver. 12.)
Efforts to be made for the good of others. (Ver. 13.)
Sorrow for having, in days past, injured others. (Ver. 14, first clause.)
Closing strain of adoring gratitude. (The last clause of vers. 14—17.)
A closing prayer for the glory of God in the land and in the earth. (Vers. 18, 19.)

This desire for God's glory, the unfailing mark of a soul in connexion with God, is expressed in terms that indicate hope as well as faith. "Be favourable to Zion for thine own sake," or, as a fruit of thy free-will, בִּרְצוֹנְךָ. This is as if he said, "I have given thee cause to forsake my kingdom and people, and even to abandon Zion, where thine ark stands; but wilt thou not rather show free grace?"

"*Build the walls of Jerusalem!*"

Make thy people in Jerusalem strong against their foes; *build up** this city which I took from the Jebusites and am seeking to beautify, though my sin might provoke thee to give it back to the Canaanite again. Make Zion and Jerusalem strong in their bulwarks as thou wilt yet do in the latter day. (Psalm xlviii. 11.)

"*Then shalt thou be pleased with sacrifices of righteousness,*" &c.

In that spot where thy name has been blasphemed by me thou shalt yet again be honoured, if instead of judgment thou sendest us victory. We shall testify of thee to all lands by the "*sacrifices* according to just rule and measure" (Levit. xix. 36), and by "*bullocks*," or the *calves of thankoffering*. (Hosea xiv. 3.) This city Jerusalem shall be a place wherein *atonement* is proclaimed, and thy praises sung by thy forgiven ones.

This last result was specially attained under *Solomon*. But in addition to what we have stated as the primary meaning, is there not a look into the future? Is not the strain to this effect:—Hasten Zion's final glory, and then shall there be no more scandals to give the enemy cause to blaspheme, no more backslidings, no more falls; then

* As in Micah iii. 10; Prov. xxiv. 3; Josh. vi. 26; 2 Chron. viii. 2, fortifying and ornamenting.

Digitized by Google

shalt thou be fully honoured as the God of atonement and fully praised with the calves of our lips. Hasten the day of Jerusalem's glory under the true Solomon.

Such is this Psalm of David—*The broken-hearted sinner's cry to the God of grace.*

Psalm LII.

In arranging the Psalms it was natural to place this one after the last, inasmuch as the assaults which it describes would no doubt be repeated in some shape on the occasion of David's fall, and even after his restoration to the full sunshine of divine fellowship. The enemy of the Woman's Seed has never in any age been at a loss for matter of calumny and reproach, nor will he cease till the Lord come and he be finally cast out.

In ver. 1, "*the mighty man*" is גִּבֹּר, even as *Nimrod* is called in Gen. x. 9, the very antithesis in character to "אֵל־גִּבֹּר," "*the mighty God*," (Isaiah ix. 6,) who is to destroy him.

In ver. 5 the true rendering of the middle clause is, "He will pluck thee out *of the tabernacle;*" not only referring us back to such cases as Korah, or any rebels whom the Lord thrust out of the holy camp of Israel, but pointing us onward to the time when "*the Tabernacle of God shall be with men.*" On that day thou shalt have no place among the blessed ones; they shall see thee uprooted with ease, and shall enjoy the "*laugh*" of Him who sitteth in the heavens (Psalm ii. 4), and of Wisdom whom thou didst despise (Prov. i. 26), but who then mocks at thy calamity. Men will not then say of the Son of God what they could say in the day of his humiliation, but shall say it of his ruined foes,—

"*Behold the man!*"—(Ver. 7.)

All along their history true Israelites could adopt and appropriate the words of ver. 8, but they shall sing it better still on the day of Antichrist's final ruin, when they become "*the olive tree*" again. At the same time it is *David's Son*, Christ himself, who best of all could sing this Psalm, and best of all could appropriate these words:—

"*I am a green olive tree in the house of God,*"—(Ver. 8,)

He being indeed the true Israelite who "continued in God's goodness" (Rom. xi. 17, 22), the tender love of his God ever being as dew on his branches. He will, on the day of his appearing, give the key-note of praise over foes overthrown for ever, raising the "Hallelujah" of Rev. xix. 2,—"*because thou hast done it.*" For nothing less than this result is what we look for and expect; and Christ is looking for that display of the Divine character along with us, "*waiting for thy name,*" as Psalm lxxv. 1 declares; when it shall be discovered in judgment acts. This is indeed

The Righteous One's hope when everywhere spoken against.

Digitized by Google

Psalm LIII.

The state of earth ought to be deeply felt by us. The world lying in wickedness should occupy much of our thoughts. The enormous guilt, the inconceivable pollution, the ineffably provoking Atheism of this fallen province of God's dominion, might be a theme for our ceaseless meditation and mourning. To impress it the more on us, therefore, this Psalm repeats what has been already sung in Psalm xiv. It is the same Psalm, with only a few words varied, "line upon line, precept upon precept;" the harp's most melancholy, most dismal notes again sounded in our ear. Not that the Lord would detain us always or disproportionably long amid scenes of sadness, for elsewhere He repeats in like manner that most triumphant melody, Psalm lx. 6—12; cviii. 6—13; but it is good to return now and then to the open field on which we all were found cast out in loathsome degradation.

There is one variation of some interest. It is in ver. 5. The words of Psalm xiv. 5 are referred to, but altered to express much more of triumph and victory on the part of God's despised ones; for the two passages run thus:—

Psalm liii.

"There were they in great fear where no fear was.
For God hath scattered the bones of the encamper against thee.
Thou hast put them to shame!
For God has despised them!"

Psalm xiv.

"There were they in great fear.
For God is in the generation of the righteous.
You shamed the counsel of the poor,
Because the Lord is his refuge."

The change in the Psalm before us seems made on purpose to declare emphatically the complete overthrow of the ungodly. And as ver. 5 expresses victory over the ungodly so fully, so also does the term employed in ver. 6. In Psalm xiv. 6 it is, "O that the *salvation*, יְשׁוּעַת, were come;" in this Psalm it is "*salvations*," "יְשֻׁעוֹת," full, entire deliverance. On these grounds they may be right who suggest that Psalm xiv. (which see) may be read as the report of the Son of man regarding earth at his *first coming*, and Psalm liii. as his description of its state and prospects at his *second*. There is certainly here more said of the full victory; so that while we gave Psalm xiv. the title of "the Righteous One's view of earth and its prospects," we are inclined to state as the contents of this,—

The Righteous One's view of earth, and his declaration of his people's final victory.

Psalm LIV.

The burden of this Psalm is simply—to what quarter should one

Digitized by Google

look for help in the time of trouble? Wholly to the Lord. "Save me by *thy name*" (v. 1), reminds us of John xvii. 11. We are kept, by the putting forth of God's *perfections* in our behalf, truth, mercy, love, power, wisdom, holiness. Our Lord was so kept by the Father, when He prayed in the words of verse 1, using them as his own, and giving his Church an instance in himself of that safe keeping.

It is in verses 6 and 7 that the *future* dawns on our view. David, David's Son, and all who follow David's Son, may exult in the prospect of that sacrifice of thankfulness to be offered. When delivered out of all distress, we shall look with triumph on our enemies; for, as Calvin remarks (quoted by Hengstenberg), "Only let the eye be pure, and we can piously and holily refresh ourselves with the manifestation of God's justice." That will be the time of the hallelujah in Rev. xix. 1—4, all resulting from his *name* glorified, his name manifested as "good." (Ver. 6.)

We have, therefore, in this short Psalm,

The Righteous One's help found in the name of the Lord.

Psalm LV.

We may read these strains as expressing David's feelings in some peculiar seasons of distress, and as the experience of members of Christ's Church in every age; for we find much, very much, that accords altogether with humanity in a state of intensely stirred emotion, and affection wounded to the quick. Yet still it is in Jesus, the Man of Sorrows, that the Psalm finds its fullest illustration. His was the soul that was stirred to its lowest depth by scenes such as are described here.

It is the wickedness of the wicked that raises this mournful cry, and makes him say,

> "I mourn in my complaint," or, "*give free course to my sorrow.*" (Ver. 2.)

It is not unlikely that our Lord, possessed as He was of true humanity, might often give utterance to the expressive wish (ver. 6), "*O that I had wings as a dove,*" when seeing the turtle-dove fly from the olives of the Mount of Olives over guilty Jerusalem, the city wherein He saw violence and strife—wickedness, deceit, and guile, never absent from her streets. Either there, or standing on some of the hills of Nazareth, He would witness the peaceful turtle-dove's rapid flight and hear its peace-suggesting note, and be led to this utterance of strong feeling, not at all unlike Him who so rejoiced in the thought, "And now I am no more in the world. Now I come to thee, Holy Father." (John xvii. 11.) He to whom He was thought to bear so close a resemblance, the weeping prophet Jeremiah, gave utterance to his wounded feelings in strains that naturally took a form like these. "Oh that I had in the wilderness a lodging-place," though only that of the *wayfaring* man! (ix. 2.) But the melancholy Psalmist here rises a degree beyond this,—

> "I would *remain* in the desert." (Ver. 7.)

Digitized by Google

The prayer in ver. 9, reminds us of Babel, where the language of earth was divided that pride might be humbled for ever, and its aims irretrievably baffled; while ver. 15, "*go quick to hell,*" at once recalls the doom of Korah and his company, who rejected the true High *Priest*, and the Lord's *King* in Jeshurun. Our Lord describes Israel, "*his own*" (John i. 11); though, especially, Judas, one of his trusted ones who owned Him as Master, in the language of ver. 13,—perishing in unbelief, having rejected the true Priest and King. He no longer acts the Intercessor's part towards such, but stands over them as a Judge, pronouncing their doom. And then in vers. 17, 18, we hear him express his confidence of full deliverance. "The twelve legions of angels" whom He might at any time have called to his help, have arrived, or rather He sees them on their way.

> "*For there are many with me.*
> "God heareth and answereth,
> "Yea, He sits enthroned for ever!" Selah (ver. 19).

It is a glance at future redress for every wrong, in the day of vengeance and the year of the redeemed. In prospect of this, ver. 22 invites us to cast our burden on the Lord, whatever that burden be, even if it be the crushing weight of persecution, and reproach, and treachery: for the Lord shall arise to hurl the foe into "the pit of destruction," parallel to "the lake of fire," "the second death," in Rev. xx. 15, in which Antichrist is sunk for ever.

In the last verse there is something of an enthymeme, for while the clause, "*the bloody and deceitful men shall not live half their days,*" predicts and portrays their doom, as cut off by untimely judgment; the responsive clause, "*And I will trust in thee,*" tells of no destiny, no fixed lot, no judgment in favour of the godly. But it nevertheless contains in it the equivalent to a declaration that his lot shall be the reverse of the bloody and deceitful; as if saying, We go different ways—they on the broad road, where ruin overtakes them speedily, and I on the safe road of faith in thee, where I shall soon meet with Him whom unseen I loved, and in whom I believed, though as yet I saw Him not. Does not, then, this Psalm depict—

The Righteous One's weary soul resting in what the Lord will do.

THE DOUBLE FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY.

No. 7.—The Infants' Hosannahs.

St. Matt. xxi. 16, compared with Psalm viii. 2.

In the preceding number of these papers I endeavoured to show that the words of the Psalmist, "Save now, I beseech thee: Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord," which were uttered by the multitude on the entrance of our Lord into Jerusalem, were yet to have

Digitized by Google

another fulfilment. In this paper I purpose considering whether the words quoted by the Lord Jesus from Psalm viii., "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected praise," met with their complete fulfilment in the ascription of praise to Him by the children of Jerusalem, on his riding into that royal city. And before I do so, I would again urge upon my readers the fact, that no passage from the Old Testament writers was quoted by our Lord or his apostles in the sense of accommodation; this it behoves us much to bear in mind, for were we not to do so we should oftentimes lose much of the great depth of meaning in many of those prophecies which, *thus* viewed, so manifestly contain within them a two-fold fulfilment. On referring to Matt. xxi. 16, we find that our blessed Lord quoted the Septuagint translation, which accounts for the different rendering of this passage in Matthew's Gospel and Psalm viii. "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected praise" (Matt.); "ordained strength" (Psalm). But though in the one the idea brought before us is "praise," in the other, "strength;" yet in both cases the great object is the assertion of the truth of God's being honoured, and his glory advanced by the mouth of babes and sucklings. The history of the Church in all ages testifies to the truth of this; for take we babes and sucklings to mean here those who are weak in faith, babes in Christ, who can but be fed with the milk of the word,—has not Jehovah, as it were, perfected strength through them? How often, for instance, does the weak and timid believer, a very babe as it were, when the hour of trial comes, exhibit a strength marvellous to behold—how often, when standing beside the bed of such an one, when in the pangs of death, undergoing all its pains and penalties, do we not feel ourselves fixed with wondering gaze at the triumph, the victory that kindles the dying one's eye; and do we not feel ourselves removed with them almost to another atmosphere, as we hear them praising and blessing their Saviour-God, commencing in their hour of greatest weakness that song which they shall join in throughout all eternity—"Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." Or take we babes and sucklings to mean here the little ones of Christ's kingdom, the history of the Church testifies to the truth that the God of glory has, as it were, perfected praise, and ordained strength from the very lispings of an infant of days. A Samuel, a Josiah, and a Timothy, have, from their very childhood, revealed his secret counsels, advanced his kingdom, and shown forth his praise; and He, the incarnate God, who was once a child Himself, took up the children in his arms, and blessed them, and poured the oil of joy and gladness into the hearts of the Jewish mothers who stood around him, and into the heart of every believing parent throughout time, by saying, "Of such is the kingdom of God." And we also read in Luke x., that the Man of sorrows rejoiced in spirit because his Father in heaven had revealed the things concerning his kingdom unto babes. But though we consider that in this two-fold sense there was, and is a continuous fulfilment of the words, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected strength," yet

Digitized by Google

we also fully believe that there was a special fulfilment of them at the time when the chorus of infant voices was heard chaunting forth, "Hosannah to the Son of David." And just because the words of the Psalmist were literally fulfilled in babes celebrating the praises of the Lord Jesus then, and as since that hour when the music of the children's voices ascribing praise unto their God, broke upon the ear in the streets of Jerusalem, many an infant's heart and infant's lips have re-echoed back that melody, sweet even to angel ears; so an hour shall yet again arrive when earth's little ones, not singly and alone—not scattered here and there—but banded together, hand clasped in hand, heart joined to heart, shall go forth a youthful yet a mighty company, and manifest the truth of the words, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies, that Thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger." This conclusion forces itself upon us from an examination of the Psalm from whence these words are taken: that it points to a yet future time an inspired commentator tells us. In Heb. ii. the Apostle Paul clearly teaches us that this Psalm concerns the Lord Jesus Christ, and that it relates to his dominion as the second Adam over the world to come, for St. Paul argues that "unto the angels hath he (God) not put in subjection the world to come. But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than (or, according to the marginal reading, a little while inferior to) the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the work of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under his feet, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him, *but* we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour." The apostle's "but" indicates that the glory and honour on which Jesus entered at his ascension is the pledge and earnest of the future subjugation to him of the "all things" spoken of by the Psalmist, so that we have conclusive proof from the use now made of this passage by the apostle, that this Psalm is yet future. And does not its very title proclaim it to be so? The meaning of the Hebrew word translated, "To the chief musician upon Gittith," being, according to Bishop Horsley, "To the Giver of victory, concerning the winepress," indicating that this Psalm was composed under the contemplation of the victories to be won by the Son of man when He shall tread the winepress alone, and of the dominion to be entered on consequent on the gathering of the vine of the earth and casting it into the great winepress of the wrath of God. The opening verse of this Psalm also testifies to its referring to a future period,—"O Lord our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth, who hast set thy glory above the heavens." The name of Jesus our Lord is now but excellent in the eyes of his own children—of his little flock, but it shall yet be excellent in the sight of all the earth, and this time shall be coeval with the period when His glory shall be "above the heaven," when it

Digitized by Google

shall be manifested to all; and then, in connexion with this, is the passage we have been dwelling on, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger." And when shall this be—when shall the last great enemy of the Lord's Anointed One be stilled? Moses in his song informs us—in that song which is yet to be sung by those who shall gain the victory over the beast, over his mark, and over his image (Rev. xv.); it is at the time when the Lord's arrows shall be drunk with blood, and His sword shall devour flesh, and that with the blood of the slain and of the captives from the beginning of revenge upon *the enemy* (Deut. xxxii. 42); and thus we see that these great events—the Lord's name being exalted in the earth—His glory being displayed—his strength being perpetuated out of the mouth of babes and sucklings, and his great enemy, the Antichrist, being stilled, are all linked together, all join the great chain of events, the last link of which is His headship as the second Adam over all things.

It is a beauteous sight to behold the love of childhood—the gushings forth of the young heart devoted to the Lord, to hear the accents of praise flowing forth from their lisping tongues; to see by the strength of the Lord given to them a striking proof of what His strength is. And oh! will it not be a beauteous sight to behold many of earth's little ones ranked on the side of the Lord of Hosts when earth's potentates, earth's mighty ones are arrayed against Him? Is it not a blessed, a happy thought, that then earth's feeble, helpless ones, the very babes and sucklings—the tender infants, shall then in a pre-eminent manner be those of whom is the kingdom of God, and earth shall then resound with their praise? And who can gainsay this, who can fully fathom the depth of the words, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, *because* of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger?"

Before closing this paper, I cannot refrain from adding one word of exhortation to any parent and teachers whose eyes may rest on these pages, and urging upon them the solemn responsibility laid on them of so teaching the little ones entrusted to them, that they may have good reason to believe that, should the great day of trial come in their generation (and its approach seems nigh at hand), the children whom God hath given them would raise Jehovah's banner, and fight manfully for the truth of God as good soldiers of the cross. Teach them, oh! teach them that word that maketh wise unto salvation. Let all the knowledge you impart to them be based on this; without it all knowledge will be but an engine in Satan's hand for arraying them against the Lord, an engine most powerful. And oh! how fearful to think of being an instrument in preparing the mind and heart of youth for the ready reception of the scoffer's jest and the Infidel's sneer—of being an instrument in adding to the mighty army which shall muster to battle against the Lord God of Hosts, and the ranks of which shall be broken by the sharp sword of Him whose name is King of kings, and Lord of lords.

Digitized by Google

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

Matt. xvii. 1—8.

(*Continued from* page 205.)

II. *The appearance of Moses and Elias.*

"And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias, talking with Him." Not Enoch, Job, Abraham, or Samuel, but Moses and Elias. Each of these two illustrious characters, as they stood before the eyes of the disciples, in their distinct personalities, were instantly recognised by them. They had never seen either of these individuals in the flesh, but a knowledge of their persons, in all probability, had been communicated to them by the immediate and miraculous agency of the Most High. And, surely, if the three disciples while in the flesh knew these heavenly visitors, it may be fairly supposed that when we enter heaven, we shall know those we have never seen in this world.

The lessons taught us by the appearance of Moses and Elias "in glory," are truly reviving and instructive. Their appearance teaches us the interesting lesson, that the righteous who have departed this life have not perished, but continue to exist in bliss and honour. Their temporary return exhibited something far better than the grapes of Eschol. Their appearance in glory bore testimony to the existence of another and a better world, where conscious, happy, and glorious life defies both time and death. They descended on mount Tabor, as two refulgent and beautiful drops from "the great cloud of witnesses" who had been raised up unto glory by the exhilirating beams of the Sun of Righteousness. How impressive, instructive, and encouraging must the whole scene have been to the disciples! They beheld *in them* what they expected to be.

1. *The appearance of Elias in a glorified body, is a palpable proof that the human body can be rendered capable of inheriting the bliss and purities of heaven.* After the prophet had "served his own generation by the will of God," he shook the dust of earth from his feet in the wilderness of Jericho, and took his seat in the chariot of fire, and rode with his angelic escort through the clouds up into glory—soul and body united, for they were never separated by death. "He was translated to heaven that he should not see death." And for nearly a thousand years he had been safe and happy in the world above. But he again visits the earth. We hail the heavenly visitant! Lo, there he stands in his own body, on the mount; yet so changed as to be rendered immortal, glorious, pure, and lovely. We behold in him *a representative* of that class of believers who shall never die; who shall be alive on the earth at the time of the Lord's coming. "Behold, I show a mystery: we shall not *all* sleep, but we shall all be changed." "They which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, shall be caught up in the clouds,

Digitized by Google

and shall be ever with the Lord." They shall never die; they shall be translated as Elias was.

2. *But what shall we say concerning Moses?* He evidently appeared in a body on the mount. For St. Luke says, "Behold, there talked with him *two men*, which were Moses and Elias." Moses, therefore, must either have assumed a human form, as angels sometimes have done, in order to converse with men, or his body must have been raised from the grave. Either one or the other must be true. Moses died, and was buried by God himself. "So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there, in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley, in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre to this day." Why is the place so distinctly named where he is buried, and yet no man knoweth of his sepulchre? There appears on the face of the history something very extraordinary. If it had been simply said, the Lord buried him, without telling us *where*, we should not have felt any surprise that no man knew of his sepulchre; but the place is mentioned, the precise locality—"in a valley, in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor." If the place is written down with such precision, how is it that no man knoweth of his sepulchre? Let the reader ponder this question, and then turn his attention to a remarkable passage concerning the body of Moses, recorded in the Epistle of Jude, verse 9: "Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil (he disputed about the body of Moses), durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." So then it appears the body of Moses was a subject of dispute between the devil and Michael the archangel: but what was the cause of the dispute? All the devil can do is to keep it in corruption; and if the body of Moses be in corruption, on what imaginable ground could this contest have taken place? But if Michael was sent to raise the body of Moses, we can then see cause why there should be a contention about it, between him and the devil, who would prevent, if possible, not only the body of Moses, but the body of every saint from being raised from the dark and loathsome grave.

There is, therefore, in the fact that Moses's sepulchre is not to be found, though the place where he was buried is distinctly stated, a strong and striking corroboration of the suspicion originated in the verse in Jude; that the body of Moses was taken away, and no trace was left of his sepulchre. Such is the evidence for the opinion that the body of Moses was raised. We regard, therefore, the appearance of Moses in glory as *a specimen* of that class of the Lord's people, who shall be raised from the dead.

Elias, then, appeared as the representative of those saints who shall be changed into glory, without sleeping in the dust. Moses appears as the representative of those saints who shall be ransomed from the grave of dishonourable corruption. We behold in Moses a specimen of what our mortal bodies will become when "that saying is fulfilled, Death is swallowed up in victory." "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." These

Digitized by Google

bodies are to be "fashioned like unto Christ's most glorious body, according to his mighty power, whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."

We proceed to notice—

3. *Their conversation.* Moses and Elias were not only seen by the disciples, but they were heard also conversing with Jesus. The subject of conversation amongst these illustrious personages was not the affairs of State, nor the revolutions of empires, nor the curious refinements of literature, nor the wonderful discoveries of philosophy. What, then, was the *theme* of their conversation? Luke gives us this valuable information,—"They appeared in glory, and spake of the decease of Jesus, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." Is it not remarkable that Moses and Elias should converse with Christ about his decease at the time of his highest exaltation upon earth? That they should speak of his crucifixion, at the time of his transfiguration, and dwell upon his shame, and agony, and death, on mount Calvary, while his face did shine as the sun on mount Tabor? Christ's decease, and that to be accomplished at Jerusalem, was the last thing which the disciples would at this moment be disposed to contemplate—the last thing they would expect Moses and Elias to converse about. They rather expected these heavenly visitants to remain with Him, and attend Him in triumph to Jerusalem, to place Him on the throne of David, and inaugurate Him King of all nations. Little did they yet understand, though prophecy was explicit on the subject, that it was by dying as a sacrifice, He was to redeem Israel. And that it was only after suffering that He was to enter into his glory. "Thus it *is written,* and thus it behoved Christ to suffer."

(To be continued.)

THE MORE EXCELLENT NAME.

Hebrews i. 4.

There is an almost boundless variety in the names given to persons and things, and many of these names testify to the vanity and folly of those who give them. Some names are without any definite meaning, and many persons whose names have a very expressive meaning, furnish a sad contrast in their character and conduct. Alas! how few in these respects, answer to their names. There is one person who once appeared in human form, and trod this earth for several years; who is still intimately connected with it, and who, ere long, will again visit it, and dwell on it; whose name is one of deepest meaning, sublimest mystery, loftiest majesty, unequalled tenderness, almighty power, and perfect wisdom; and whose person, character, and actions, fully answer to his name. God, who cannot err, hath given Him his name. God, who knows all things, bears witness

Digitized by Google

that He is worthy of the name He wears, and commends it to our most earnest and constant attention. He tells us that if we would be wise, happy, rich, and honourable, we must come into continual contact with this name. He tells us that in it his own character is unfolded, and that by it his paternal love can be communicated, and his saving power displayed. "My name (says Jehovah) is in Him. Here you may see infinity, and possess it. Here you may behold perfect holiness, and share it. Here I will condescend to your weakness and ignorance, and soften down my glories so that you shall bear to gaze upon them. If I, the Holy Creator, and you the sinful creature, ever meet as friends, you must meet me in this name. Here you must seek my favour, if you wish to share it. In this name you may learn all that is worth knowing, and by it possess all that is worth having. It is an ocean of merit, and will hide your sins; it is a sun of glory, and will dry up your sorrows; it is an universe of wonders, and will employ your intellect for ever and ever."

Come, then, let us address ourselves to the study of this glorious name, and looking up to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, earnestly seek the guidance of that gracious Spirit who alone can open up its wonders to the mind, and reveal its blessings in the heart. May "He who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, shine in the heart;" and make the name of Jesus to be all to us that God intends it to be; that so we may sing with deep gratitude and holy wonder, "His name shall be called WONDERFUL!" The *import of this name*, *its glories*, and the *claims* which it has upon all who have found life and salvation in it, will employ our attention.

Names are of great use among men, and attention to this point will assist us in studying the *import* of his glorious name, who is the express image, and unspeakable gift of God. A name is commonly used to *designate* an individual, and thus to distinguish him from all other persons. This end is very imperfectly attained to by human names. Notwithstanding all the plans which have been resorted to, few persons succeed in monopolizing a name to themselves; but the name of Jesus is perfectly unique. His is a name above every name. (Phil. ii. 9; Ephes. i. 21.) God, no doubt, calls all the angelic stars (even as He does the firmamental orbs) by their names; but he testifies concerning his Son, who is "the bright and the morning star," that "He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." (Heb. i. 4.) By his name He is distinguished from all other beings—none dare usurp his name without being guilty of the greatest folly and impiety. He is not merely "*one* Jesus," as a petty governor (whose very name would have long since been forgotten, but for his connexion with Him,) once termed Him (Acts xxv. 19), but He is *the* one Jesus—the only Saviour. His name stands first in the book of life, and shall shine brightest in the annals of eternity. This name by which He is designated, and which distinguishes Him from all others; at the mention of which every knee shall bow; and whose glories shall never fade,—is the name JESUS.

A name is used among men to *describe* as well as to *designate*.

Digitized by Google

This was the case when Adam gave names to all the creatures which God formed. No doubt the names given were expressive of the qualities of the creatures to whom they were affixed. In the Scriptures we frequently read of names being given to persons and places, descriptive of the gratitude, and expressive of the hopes, of the individuals who gave them. Thus, Abraham called the name of the mountain where he was about to sacrifice Isaac, "Jehovah-Jireh." So Samuel set up a stone at the place of deliverance, and called it "Ebenezer." On the same principle, the mother of Jabez gave him a name which recorded her own exercises of mind in connexion with him. In like manner, all the names of Jesus are *descriptive*, and are intended to set forth his excellences. They are none of them mere empty titles, but are all full of blessed meaning. A name among men is frequently the representative of nothing, but the name of Jesus is the representative of infinity. His name describes what he *was*. He was the Word, even the Word who was with God, and was God. He, as "the Wisdom," was with God before the world was. (Prov. viii.) His names, "Wisdom," "Word," and "Lamb slain before the foundation of the world," not only declare his personal Godhead, but also his headship; exhibiting Him as the great ONE, in whom the Church was chosen; in whom all blessings were treasured up; who is the foundation of God's glory, and the centre of all his purposes; and who was eternally preordained to all the wonders and glories which cluster around his incarnation, humiliation, exaltation, and coming reign.

His name describes *what He has done*. Frequently, among men, the words name and fame are used interchangeably. A man's name is often a record of his fame. The deeds he has done are inscribed on the names given him: this is frequently seen in the high-sounding titles of naval and military heroes. It is the case with the Captain of our salvation; in his name we have the record of his deeds. His victories over sin, death, and hell, are emblazoned on the names He wears. These victories are all righteous and beneficial, and the names which record them very glorious.

His name describes what *He is*. His person is not here; but we have his name, which reveals his character, and, if we make a right use of this, we shall have his presence. There are two books of the New Testament which are especially designed to set forth Jesus as He appears in the inner sanctuary; these are the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Book of the Revelation. If these are well studied, and the titles of Jesus, which they contain, diligently searched out, we may learn from them to think of Him as He now appears in glory, even as, by the study of the four evangelists, we come to know Him as He once appeared on earth. In connexion with this, it may be observed that his name describes *what He is now doing*. Men give each other names descriptive of office, and this is frequently done to those who have already gained names or titles of *fame*. So it is with Jesus. He has got a name of renown by his labours and victories on earth, and God, as a reward to Him, and out of love to his people, has given Him a name of office. The personal name, "Jesus," *distinguishes*

Digitized by Google

Him; the official name, "Christ," "Messiah," or "Anointed," *describes* Him. His name is the Prophet like unto Moses, the Priest after the order of Melchisedec, and the King of Glory, faintly shadowed forth by Solomon. He wears the names of advocate, physician, friend, brother, and these all help to describe what He now is, and what He is doing.

His name also describes what *He is to be*, and *to do*. While his name is *historical*, inasmuch as it records his ancient glories, his virtues and victories; while it is *descriptive*, reflecting, as it does, his glorious work and gracious heart; it is also *prophetic*, because it most assuredly foretels what He will be, and what He will do. His name is "the Second Adam," the "King of kings and Lord of lords," the "Sovereign Judge," and Almighty avenger. His name foretels and ensures the overthrow of his enemies, the destruction of death, the renovation of earth, the salvation of Israel, and the restoration of man. How glorious will that world to come be, which shall bear upon it the full impress of the name of this glorious restorer! Grace teaches us now something of the excellency of the name of Christ, as Priest; and glory, or the kingdom of God revealed, will be the unfolding of his name as King. It was said of Solomon, "he shall build a house *for my name;*" in doing this, he was a type of Jesus, who shall write his own name and his Father's name upon the new creation, which He will rear and fill with his glory. Thus the name of Jesus is a mirror, a medium, and an instrument. In it God's glories are to be seen, through it God's goodness flows, and by it God's power puts forth its noblest energies, and will continue to do so, "until all things shall be subdued unto him."

A name, among men, is frequently a ground of *dependance*. If persons engaged in business see the name of a well-known individual attached to any new project or enterprise, this inspires confidence. When soldiers hear that a general who has got a name is to be their leader, this fills them with courage. A name has often been a battle-cry which has dismayed the foe, and helped to procure the victory. The name of Jesus is given us to be the ground of our confidence, and food for our courage. He is compared to all that is stable and sacred: to a rock, refuge, and sanctuary. To all that is necessary and suitable: bread, living water, light, and life. To all that is kind and affectionate; for He fills up those relations on which our confidence as creatures is reposed for earthly solace and happiness. Everything is said of Him that can be said to warrant and encourage our confidence in his glorious name. As the Jew of old depended on the name of Israel's God for temporal deliverances, and in simple dependance on it went forth against the foe, so should the believer depend on the Redeemer, and go forth to the spiritual conflict, setting up his banners in his name.

Once more, a name is frequently, among men, expressive of *delight*. It shows the complacence of him who utters it. What melody there is in the names of some individuals! how they linger in our memories, even after the loved objects are far away! We cannot, will not forget

Digitized by Google

them, with their sweet, though sometimes painful, associations. The name of Jesus is all sweetness; it is full of glory and overflowing with love.

How much delight is there in the heart, while the lip of faith utters his name in fervent prayer or grateful praise, and the hand of faith appropriates Him, with all his blessings, to the heart. "*My* beloved." "*Our* Lord Jesus Christ." If the name Jesus *distinguishes* Him—if the name Christ *describes* Him—if his title, as Lord, shows Him to be the ground of *dependance*, certainly the possessive pronoun, "*our*," sets forth the heart's *delight* in Him. His name is full of the richest associations, without any painful recollections; there is everything in Him to kindle complacent love, and to feed the heavenly flame. We understand, then, by the *name* of Christ, his person, his character, his work, his fame, his offices, his relationships, and glorious prospects. In addition to this, we may observe that the term name, sometimes signifies his *cause*, his *authority*, or "*for his sake.*"

Having attempted this brief exposition of the *import* of his name, let us now go on to gaze at its *glories*, by meditating on the testimony of God concerning it. Jacob, at Penuel, earnestly inquired, "What is thy name?" and so did Manoah, when the angel of the covenant appeared to him. Moses also fervently prayed, "I beseech thee, shew me thy glory;" and the Lord answered him, and will answer us if we possess such desires, by "proclaiming his name." May we listen reverently, while the eternal Father speaks to us concerning Him who is his well-beloved Son.

The name of Jesus is a *saving* name. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21); and this is the *only* name in which this power resides, "for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv. 12.) No other is needed, any more than two suns are required in the solar system, or two hearts in the human body. The salvation which he bestows is complete, as it is deliverance from all evil; and comprehensive, as it includes all good. It is his own name in paraphrase, his own love in act. It is eternal as his name, and lifts up the soul and body of all who embrace it into participation of his own glory.

It is a *living and life-giving name.* He is "*the life*," "the light of life," "the resurrection and the life." His name can never die, nor can it ever fail to impart life to all who believe on it. How encouraging the words of the beloved disciple, when reviewing what he had written concerning his great Master, and thinking how much more *might* have been said, he exclaimed, "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John xx. 31.) Jesus himself also testified, "He that believeth in me (the life), though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." (John xi. 25, 26.) What a name is this to give life to the dead, and to make the living more lively! By contact with Him, the guilty are justified, the unholy sanctified, the distant brought near, and the

Digitized by Google

soul, alienated from the life of God, brought into fellowship with the living Father. This noble life is sustained, and its vigour increased, by the soul's continually coming to Him, as unto a living stone—that rock whence living waters flow. By eating his flesh and drinking his blood, his people live by Him as He lives by the Father. Without this real, vital connexion with Christ, which is with the renewed soul a matter of necessity, choice, and delight, religion is but a name without life. Those who thus live on Him will live *for* Him: the springs of their happiness and strength are hid with Christ in God. (Col. iii. 3.) Death shall not injure *them*, death is among those things which are said to be *theirs*, because they are Christ's. "For them to live is Christ, and to die gain;" and "when Christ who is their life shall appear, they shall appear with Him in glory," and "live together with Him." All these blessed privileges and glorious hopes are the offspring of his name; beams from Him, the glorious Sun of Righteousness. Sing we, then, "*He shall live!*" rejoice we in Him as the Almighty *conservator* of life for all his people, and the glorious *manifester* of the living God.

His name is *healing*, yea, it is full of health. What Peter testified concerning the poor cripple who lay so long at the gate of the temple may also be said concerning millions of healed souls, "His name through faith in his name hath made this man strong whom ye see and know; yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." (Acts iii. 16.) Sin is a terrible disease, all the maladies to which the human body is incident are types, and only types, of its fearful triumphs in the soul of man. Sin takes the forms of raging fever, fiery madness, debilitating palsy, loathsome and incurable leprosy. It is blindness, deafness, lameness; yea, all that is hideous and painful. It deforms the soul, and robs it of all strength and beauty, and is ever dragging it down to the eternal putrefaction of the second death. All human means fail to arrest its ravages; men have produced what they called infallible medicines, but nothing has succeeded, they have proved "physicians of no value." The pestilence hath still progressed, and must have done so for ever, had not the great Phineas stood between the dead and the living, and stayed the plague. His name is heaven's sovereign remedy. Millions of sick and dying creatures have stood around his cross, and sung, "By his stripes we are healed," and while they exult in their own spiritual cure, and rejoice in health restored, in the possession of peace, of joy, and a desire to glorify Him, and all his gifts, they herald his name and delight to tell its sovereign virtues. Believer, thou art in a convalescent state, bless God for this; but daily live on the name of Jesus, or your wounds will break out afresh, your strength will decline, your spiritual senses will all be weakened. You have a conflict to wage, and may be wounded sorely; you have a wilderness to pass through, and may be torn by its briars or bitten by the serpents and savage beasts which roam there: make constant use of this healing name. If guilt is contracted, if temptation prevail, if cares gall your soul, if human unkindness wounds you, fly to the name of Jesus, and from his

Digitized by Google

merit, strength, sympathy, and faithfulness, you may obtain strong consolation.

The name of Jesus is *fragrant.* Hark to the testimony of one who loved Him, "Because of the savour of thy good ointments, thy name is as ointment poured forth." The Saviour is here presented to us as the *anointed one,* and as the result of his anointing, his name is likened to a sweet perfume. God hath "anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows, and all his garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia." He was anointed at his baptism, and what a name did He soon obtain, a name still full of fragrance. Immediately after the Holy Spirit had descended on Him, we find Him victorious over Satan (Matt. iv. 1—11), distributing all blessings among the sick and sorrowful (Matt. iv. 23—25), and then teaching the most consolatory truths, showing who are blessed; and inviting the wretched to share that blessedness. (Matt. v. 1—12.) For more than three years his name as a conqueror, physician, teacher, was "poured forth" like a rich ointment. "A good name (says wisdom) is better than precious ointment" But the same authority tells us "that dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour, so doth a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honour." (Eccles. x. 1.) But in Jesus there was wisdom without folly, holiness without sin, tenderness without unkindness, sympathy without forgetfulness, and love without the possibility of a change. How fragrant is his name! As Mary's ointment filled the house, so does the name of Jesus fill that noble temple of truth which the Holy Spirit reared by the hands of the four evangelists. "Sweet is the breath of early morn," sweet indeed must it have been in the bowers of an unfallen paradise, but sweeter still to the spiritual senses of God's people is the savour of the name of Jesus in the field of inspired truth. Blessed are those who love to trace all his sayings and doings, and who abide among them in loving meditation as the bee in the fragrant flower.

When Jesus ascended up on high he was again anointed, and the savour of his name as our Great High Priest fills the upper sanctuary, and also the tabernacle below. The sweet savour of his atoning sacrifice (Eph. v. 1, 2), of his much incense (Rev. viii. 3—5), of his unbounded sympathy and unutterable tenderness (Heb. iv. 14), is indeed most pleasant.

Oh, to have this name so poured out before us by Him who glorifies Jesus as to "count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord." Oh, to have it so poured out upon us that "our heads may lack no ointment," that others may "take knowledge of us that we have been with Jesus." Let us aim to be holy and chaste, and seek grace to be "vessels to bear his name;" yea, to manifest the savour of his knowledge in every place. In thus acting we shall imitate the blessed (Rev. v.), and be followers of God. (Heb. i.) If we would act thus, let us seek to know Him as the Rose of Sharon, the Lily of the Valleys, the Branch, the Tree of Life, and Plant of Renown.

His name is an enriching name. How suited is it to those whom He came to save! The sinner is rich in misery, and poor as regards

Digitized by Google

happiness. Rich in wrath, but destitute of all claim on the Divine goodness, and this because he is rich in guilt, and poor in righteousness, rich in enmity, and destitute of love. Yet before this destitute and desolate creature the whole choir of prophets stand, and they all testify concerning Jesus, "that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts x. 43.) Yet again, a solo, grand as the voice of the archangel, is heard, "God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." (2 Cor. v.) Higher yet rises the testimony!—"As many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John i. 12.) Once again, hearken: He who spake as never man spake confirms and consummates the whole, and invites all the sons and daughters of poverty, every bankrupt child of Adam to whom the tidings came, to share the blessedness. "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." (John vii. 37, 38.) Who can reckon up these treasures! reconciliation, remission, righteousness, relationship, reception of the Holy Spirit; how wonderful! And then think of the firm friendship established, the joys of pardon in the heart, and the knowledge of salvation,—what it brings, of the privileges of adoption, the claim upon infinite and paternal love, the witnessings of the Holy Spirit, and his outflowings from the heart and character for the good of others, and all without money and without price, all in the face of the greatest unworthiness, all to God's highest glory, all *through* the name of Jesus, and all *in* believing *on* his name.

The name of Jesus is a joy-inspiring name. It is said of the blessed people who know the joyful sound, "In thy name shall they rejoice all the day." It is his name which makes the Gospel a joyful sound. The Gospel is the record of his mighty acts, an exhibition of his glorious person and spotless character, a proclamation of the blessings which dwell in him, and an announcement of his coming glory and everlasting reign. Here is complete harmony, and blessed are the ears which are attuned to delight in the same. "The God of hope fills them with joy and peace *in believing.*" Believing in Him whom now we see not, but whose name we may study, "we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." In all seasons and under all circumstances, this name can fill the heart with joy. He who wears it is the true Noah, "the consolation of Israel." The followers of Christ are sometimes brought into the wilderness of gloom and sorrow, in order that they may more fully know the virtue and the value of the name of Jesus; and often when bereft of all, when called to dwell solitary, or to be familiar with scenes of trial and death, the name of Jesus has peopled the wilderness with joys, and turned "the shadow of death into the morning." "Rejoice in the Lord always," is God's gracious command, and having given it, He reveals

Digitized by Google

the name of his Son,—his Beloved One, and our Brother, and then amidst all life's sorrows, and death's terrors, the believer's heart responds to the Divine command, and sings sweet "songs in the night" to the praise of the name of Jesus.

This joy is an earnest of that overflowing rapture and triumph which shall be realized when the name of Jesus shall be read in the light of glory. His name shall be the procuring and sustaining cause of all the joy of eternity.

In order for it to be a joy-inspiring name, we must know it as a *justifying and sanctifying name.* "This is his name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." And again it is written, "Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 Cor. vi. 11.) How glorious is that righteousness, how completely are those justified who are arrayed in it! How real is that sanctification! His name is a fountain most pure, most cleansing, and withal incapable of pollution, and ever accessible to the guilty and filthy. Those who rest on it for acceptance, and who make use of it for cleansing, shall be washed from all stain of sin, and be presented faultless before the presence of God's glory. On such He will write his own name, yea, the inscription on his priestly mitre shall be placed on their foreheads, and by the virtue of his name, "HOLINESS TO THE LORD" shall be inscribed on their entire nature, body, soul, and spirit.

Such will testify that his is "*a worthy name.*" (James ii. 7.) When on earth He won a worthy name, but man did all he could to rob Him of his glory, and injure his fair fame. Men called Him what Satan bid them, and in so doing, contradicted God, and turned the Rock of Ages into "a stumbling stone, and a sign to be spoken against." Through life He was hunted by reproach; He was maligned in death; and his memory loaded with scorn. He was crucified as a deceiver, and his name became among the nation a synonyme for impostor. Mark the contrast! "He was led like a lamb to the slaughter," amidst the jeers of the nation; but hark! what sound is that, mightier than many waters, louder than ten thousand thunders, yet sweeter than the softest melody? Clearly and distinctly, from ten thousand times ten thousand voices, rolls the glorious anthem, "WORTHY IS THE LAMB." This is the unanimous verdict of the heavenly world; saints redeemed by blood, and angels upheld by omnipotence, all unite in it; and their concurrent testimony is not only in complete contrast with that of earth, but is an echo of the testimony of God. How cheering the thought that the Almighty Spirit, the glorifier of Jesus, hath engaged to lift up on high his vilified name, and to espouse his slighted cause; and that *He* is training up on earth a goodly company to witness from age to age, that Jesus is worthy, and to swell at last into a fuller burst of harmony the praises of the upper sanctuary. May all who lisp his worthy praise show that they count Him worthy of their trust, their confidence, and service, as well as of their testimony.

Well may that name, from which such blessings flow, and where such beauties shine, be called "*wonderful.*" It is such, for it is

Digitized by Google

infinite. "Thou shalt call his name Immanuel; God with us." (Isa. vii. 14.) He in whom the divine and human natures are united; He who can fill up all relations, sustain all offices, and be at once a fountain of glory, grace, and government; filling heaven with joy, saving sinners on earth, and overruling the rage and malice of devils, is indeed WONDERFUL. His name is comprehensive of all knowledge; "in Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." His name has been termed "God's encyclopædia," and furnishes matter for eternal study. His name effects the greatest wonders. It was the Holy Spirit who taught the Church to pray, "that signs and wonders might be done in the name of the holy child Jesus" (Acts iv. 30); and this prayer has been largely answered. Mountains of guilt has it rolled away. It has dried up seas of pollution, and stilled the tempest of angry passions in millions of bosoms. Hosts of devils have fled before it, and Death himself has been conquered by it. And soon we shall see greater things than these. That name shall destroy the last enemy, death; for ever crush the power of the old serpent; and fill this groaning earth with the glory of God. Would you behold Jehovah as a God doing wonders; study Him whose name is Wonderful. Surely then the name of Jesus is a *glorious* name. It tells of what He is, hath done, is now doing, and will yet perform. In it we see God revealed; by it God is communicated, and through it God works. Look at that name, and what do you see? GLORY. Mild, majestic, heart-melting, soul-transforming glory. What flows through it? Life and salvation, including pardon, peace, holiness, adoption, and eternal joy. What does it effect? It frees, it quickens, it beautifies, it cheers through life, and solaces in death. Is it not glorious? If sinners are saved by it—if God is manifested in it, and glorified by it—if it gladdens all heaven and conquers death and hell—is it not glorious—a name above every name?

Rejoice we then that this glorious name is an *everlasting* name. Many names once great and renowned have faded from remembrance; but the name of Jesus lives, and must for ever flourish. Some names are remembered only as terms of infamy; but HE is remembered by his virtues. Time makes it shine with still brighter lustre, and through the cycles of eternity it shall increase in glory. Are we identified with it—have we life there? Is his name our refuge, our home, our treasure, our all? Join we then our song with that of the sweet singer of Israel: "His name shall endure for ever, his name shall be continued as long as the sun, and men shall be blessed in Him: all nations shall call Him blessed."

(To be continued.)

ISAIAH XVII. 1.

"Damascus shall be removed from being *a city*."

IT is yet a large town, beautifully situated, and long has it been admired. Is the word, then, fallen to the ground? No; it is no more "a CITY" in the sense of a *metropolis*, or a *capital*. "*It is become a*

Digitized by Google

heap, a carcase," חֳרִיחָה מְעִי מַפָּלָה—not, as our version, "a ruinous heap," but a heap that is the *carcase* of what it once was. It is the dead lump of what it once was; its commerce and gaiety and wealth are gone. As Luther said of Rome (see D'Aubigné, vol. i., p. 171), "The *Rome* of the Scipios and Cæsars has been changed *into a carcase.* Such is the mass of ruins that the foundations of the houses at this day rest where the roofs formerly were." Besides this, however, we would say that *Rome* was just the *carcase* of the ancient city in regard to the absence of life and liberty and power.

"PROFESSION OF OUR FAITH."

HEBREWS x. 23.

OUR version has, in this instance, made a very singular change in the text of the original. No MS. whatever, I believe, reads anything else than "την ὁμολογιαν της ἐλπιδος;" the confession, or "profession of *Hope.*" Perhaps from the neglect into which "The Blessed Hope" had fallen, our translators felt as if "Confession of *Hope*" had no meaning. At any rate, they have changed the word "Hope" into "*Faith;*" without the vestige of an authority. The Vulgate renders, "*Spei nostræ confessio;* Beza, "*Spei nostræ professio;*" Luther, "Der Verkenntniss der Hoffnung;" the French version in the Polyglott, "La profession de notre esperance." So also the Syriac.

How much more expressive in the connexion is the true reading. "Having gone into the Holiest for strength and grace, let us go forth to the world, holding up the confession of the Hope we cherish of the Lord's coming again, a hope which He will not disappoint, for He is faithful that promised; and all this, so much the more as ye see The Day approaching."

Reviews.

Defence of Pre-millennialism a Delusion, and Millenarian Tactics Exposed. By REV. W. M. WHITE. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter.

WE think it right that our readers should be made acquainted with the existence of this pamphlet, which most fully confirms all that we said of the essay, of which it professes to be a defence. We could not have taken any further notice of a publication which violates all the decencies of controversy; but independently of this, we have now learned enough of the author's past history to induce us to decline any controversy with him whatever. He cannot have forgotten what took

Digitized by Google

place in Fifeshire some few years ago; and the remembrance of it should have made him a humbler man. He has not succeeded in overthrowing so much as one of the many charges we brought against him; and the way in which he has evaded them, has made us feel that they are *thoroughly unanswerable.**

The Last Things; an Examination of the Doctrine of Scripture concerning the Resurrection, the Second Coming of Christ, and the Millennium. By the Rev. W. Wood, A.M. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1851.

When we reviewed this work some time ago, we promised to return to it. This we have hitherto been unable to do, from great press of matter. As we do not, however, wish to leave our promise any longer unfulfilled, we take up the volume again, with the view of laying before our readers some of the author's acute and scholar-like criticisms on several passages which have been handled in the controversy. We cannot either preface or intersperse them with observations of our own. We must just give them as they occur, again recommending the whole volume to the study of our readers.

1. As to the resurrection "out of the dead."

"The phrases which are used in connexion with αναστασις, 'resurrection,' are the following:—

"1. Αναστασις νεκρων, 'resurrection of dead ones;' Acts xvii. 32, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 15, 21, xxvi. 23; Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21; Heb. vi. 2.

"To this may be joined the phrase, ἡ αναστασις των νεκρων, 'the resurrection of the dead;' Matt. xxii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 42.

"2. Αναστασις εκ νεκρων, 'resurrection from among dead ones;' 1 Pet. i. 3.

"And ἡ αναστασις ἡ εκ νεκρων, 'the resurrection—that one from among dead ones.' (Luke xx. 35; Acts iv. 2.)

* He excuses his blunder about *Xeuxies* by saying that he had no dictionary beside him! Does a *scholar* not know how to spell the names of the ancients? And are we to sustain this as his excuse for calling *Stephens* by the name of *Stephanas?* ("Defence," p. 45.) The Genevan printer may pass under the name either of *Stephens* or *Stephanus* (if Latinized), but Mr. White is the first critic that has tried *Stephanas.* His knowledge both of ancient or modern criticism must be slender enough, else such a blunder could not have slid from his pen. Mr. White attempts to fortify his unsound statements about our Lord's humanity and "spiritual death," by quotations from old theologians. It is curious that the followers of Edward Irving did the same. In the year 1830, they published a tract of twelve pages, entitled "Extracts from Divines on the Humanity of Christ." Some of the authors from which they quoted are Mr. White's authorities. Mr. White's statements in his pamphlet on this point are worse and more objectionable than those in his book. How far he has gone into the path of error it is not easy to say. Mr. White's temper especially directs itself against Mr. H. Bonar. Now even though Mr. B. had been (which he is not) the author of both reviews of Mr. White's work, it is not usual to *name* the Editor of a Journal, and attack him personally,—nay, more, to assail his friends in addition to himself. Mr. White may not think it wrong to append his own name to a work or article, which is not his own, but he must know that it is wrong to take the same freedom with the name of another.

Digitized by Google

"3. Ἡ ἐξαναστασις των νεκρων, 'the out-resurrection of or from the dead.' (Phil. iii. 11.)

"It will be observed, that in Nos. 2 and 3, the preposition εκ or εξ is used in connexion with αναστασις, 'resurrection.' I am prepared to affirm, that whenever this is the case it is the resurrection of the just that is referred to, or at least a resurrection in which some are left behind. The first passage is in 1 Pet. i. 3, where the resurrection of Christ is spoken of. His was certainly a resurrection *out from among* the dead. The next passage is Luke xx. 35, 'But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection, the one *from out of* the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage.' Here unquestionably it is the resurrection of the just which is spoken of. Then comes Acts iv. 2, 'Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection, *the one from among* the dead.' The reduplication of the article, in this as in the former quotation, proves that it is the resurrection of the just that is spoken of. The words ἡ α. ἡ εκ νεκρων, 'the resurrection, that one out from among the dead,' necessarily implies that there was another resurrection, not 'from among,' but 'of the dead.' Whereas the phrase, ἡ α ἡ των νεκρων, is not found in the New Testament. 'The resurrection, that one *of* the dead,' would be absurd; for what other resurrection could there be?

* * * * * * * * *

"The result of our inquiry is, (1.) that the phrase 'out of,' or 'from the dead,' εκ or απο νεκρων is *never* used in the New Testament except of a resurrection in which others are left behind; and that it is used thirty-five times of the resurrection of Christ. (2.) That the phrase αναστασις νεκρων, 'of the dead,' is never used of the resurrection of believers as such, although in one place (1 Cor. xv. 42), ἡ αν. των ν. is used apparently with this latter application, but in reality, as I venture to think, with a different shade of meaning. (3.) That the resurrection of Christ is always said to be εκ νεκρων, 'from out of the dead,' except in two passages, where the εκ is omitted for the sake of euphony."

2. As to the passage in Dan. xii. 2.

"I think I shall have no difficulty in showing, that the resurrection of the wicked is not spoken of at all in this passage. It stands thus in the original:—

וְרַבִּים מִיְּשֵׁנֵי אַדְמַת־עָפָר יָקִיצוּ אֵלֶּה לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם וְאֵלֶּה לַחֲרָפוֹת לְדִרְאוֹן עוֹלָם

"The very first words present a difficulty on the hypothesis of our opponents. 'MANY shall awake,' but, according to them, it should have been '*all.*' 'I am disposed,' says Mr. Brown in his note (p. 200), 'with Marckius, to take the word *many* in this place, as equivalent to *the multitude* of. This meets the difficulty which Cocceius starts, that though "the many" may be equivalent to "all," it is not equivalent to "many of all."' May I venture to whisper to Mr. Brown, that he is here taking a liberty with the words of Scripture much greater than we do, when we say that 'all the saints' means 'all then existing?' For the Hebrew words will not bear the rendering '*the* multitude of,' but only '*a* multitude of,' which is strictly equivalent to 'many.' The most literal version I can give of the original is the following:—'Many *out of* (the Hebrew מ being equivalent to the Greek εκ) the sleepers in the dust of the earth shall wake: these to life everlasting, and these to shame and contempt everlasting.' The first clause naturally implies, that while *some* are raised, *others* are left behind. The resurrection is of many *out of* the sleepers. And what can be more natural than to refer the last clause in its two portions to those who rise and those who are left behind? Many shall wake out of the sleepers; those (who wake) to everlasting life, those (who sleep) to everlasting shame. I am told by those who are better acquainted with the Hebrew language than I can pretend to be, that this translation is perfectly admissible: and it is altogether consistent with the language of the New Testament, which describes the resurrection of believers as *out of the dead*, εκ νεκρων."

Digitized by Google

3. As to the grammatical construction of the expression, "restitution of all things, which," &c.

"The original is χρονων αποκαταστασεως παντων ὡν ελαλησεν ὁ Θεος. It is plain that, grammatically, the relative ὡν may be referred either to χρονων (times), or to παντων (all things); and in the latter case it stands (as Mr. Brown remarks) for ἁ by the attraction of the genitive following. But if ὡν be connected with χρονων, it may equally stand for ὁυς (which Mr. Brown seems not to have observed), and the meaning then will be, 'the times which God hath announced, or declared, or spoken of.' For λαλεω does take an accusative after it in this sense. Thus, 'We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard' (ἁ ειδομεν μη λαλειν, Acts iv. 20). 'That which she hath done shall be spoken of or declared.' (λαληθησεται και ὁ εποιησεν, Matt. xxvi. 13). 'Saying nothing else than what the prophets also announced" (ὡν οἱ προφηται ελαλησεν, Acts xxvi. 22. See also 2 Sam. vi. 22). Or otherwise we may take ὡν for περι ὡν, a supposition to which no Greek scholar will, I suppose, make any objection. Have Pre-millennialists alone supported this rendering? It is the rendering of Beza and Lampe, both of whom translate thus, 'DE *quibus locutus est Deus*.' It is the rendering, too, of Castalio. '*Ad tempora instaurationis omnium quæ tempora Deus tot suorum sanctorum ore vatum jam olim fatus est.*' It is the version of Doddridge, 'The times of the regulation of all things *concerning* which God hath spoken.' Mr. Cunningham informs us, that the late learned Dr. Routh having had the question referred to him, 'What is the antecedent of ὡν in Acts iii. 21?' answered decidedly that ὡν must, in order to make sense, agree with χρονων. Bloomfield places a comma between παντων and ὡν, and never even alludes to the construction by which the former of these words is made the antecedent of the latter. Rosenmuller speaks very decidedly on the point. 'Winzer correctly remarks,' he says, 'that the pronoun ὡν is not connected with παντων, but with χρονων; as appears from the twenty-fourth verse, where Peter declares that, besides Moses, whom he had already mentioned, all the other prophets also had announced *these days*' (τας ἡμερας ταυτας)."

Such are a few mere specimens, in addition to those we gave formerly, of Mr. Wood's clear and satisfactory criticisms. If our readers wish a full and well-arranged answer to all that has been advanced in refutation of Pre-millennialism, let them possess Mr. Wood's volume.

Memoirs of the Lives of Robert Haldane and of his Brother, J. A. Haldane. By ALEXANDER HALDANE, Esq. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1852.

A VOLUME of great price, both as a book of history and biography. It is a work fitted both to arouse and to rebuke; it shows us how much more we might do for God were we but more straightforward, single-eyed, and fearless. The brothers did good service to the Church of God in their day, and the results of their efforts are not ended. The labours of Robert Haldane on the Continent were signally blessed, and form an era in the history of Geneva. His exertions in behalf of pure Bible circulation and his bold defence of the inspiration of the Word of God are things for which not only his country, but Europe, owes him much. We would most urgently commend to the notice and study of our readers his work on "The Authenticity and Inspiration of the Scriptures." It is even more needed now than it was thirty years ago. There are one or two references to the second coming of our Lord

Digitized by Google

throughout the volume, but nothing of any moment. Mr. James Haldane, it is said, "rejected the idea of Christ's personal reign .... before the regeneration of the heavens and earth," but "the hope of the second appearing of our Lord was one which ever occupied his thoughts." (P. 659.)

We wish that more pains had been taken in reference to the orthography of the proper names. The errors in the spelling, especially of Scotch names, both of places and individuals, are very numerous.

The First Resurrection; or, a Dissertation wherein the prior and special Resurrection and Reward of the most eminent Christian Witnesses during the Rage of Paganism and Anti-Christianism is considered, &c. By Robert Fleming. 1708.

Robert Fleming is the author of the little work entitled, "The Rise and Fall of the Papacy," reprinted and widely circulated a few years ago. He was an able and learned man. In the treatise concerning the first resurrection he maintains that it is a *literal* not a *figurative* resurrection, and takes up the third chapter of Philippians at great length, affirming that wherever we read *ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, the Spirit of God designs to give us a more direct or more oblique hint of the special resurrection of the more eminent saints. With much of the dissertation we do not agree, but it is interesting to see such a scholar and divine demonstrating the literality of the first resurrection even while denying Christ's reign on earth.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-law, the Rev. W. Hanna, LL.D. Vol. IV. Edinburgh: T. Constable and Co. 1852.

This volume places the last stone upon the monument of this wondrous Scotchman; for the more that his character and doings are studied, the more wondrous will he appear. We enter into no examination of it; our limited province forbids us; yet we cannot but express our delight in the perusal of the whole work and our admiration for the skill, the tact, the power with which the biographer has executed one of the most difficult tasks which ever devolved upon a writer.

The world knows now the whole extent of the loss it sustained when Dr. Chalmers was summoned away. Less than these four volumes could not have told it all.

The Christian's Fireside Library. Johnstone and Hunter. 1852.

Of this library four volumes for this year are now before us, viz., "Pascal's Letters," M'Ilvaine's "Evidences," Payson's "Memoir," and Dr. Beggs' "Handbook of Popery." The first three are not new, but the last is, and is a most admirable compendium of the whole Popish controversy.

Digitized by Google

The Millennial Kingdom; being Lectures delivered during Lent, 1852, at St. George's, Bloomsbury, &c. London: Shaw. 1852.

TWELVE most scriptural and profitable Lectures; some fresher and more vigorous than others, but all of them excellent.

The Doctrine of the Cherubim; being an Inquiry into the Symbolical Character and Design of the Cherubic Figures of Holy Scripture. By GEORGE SMITH, F.A.S. London: Longman.

A MOST able and satisfactory volume which we ought long ere this to have noticed. On one or two minor points we may slightly differ, but in the main we entirely and heartily accord with him.

Waiting, Watching, Looking. By JOHN G. MANSFORD. J. Nisbet and Co.

BRIEF, but pointed and scriptural in its statements and arguments.

Honest Thoughts on Scripture. London: Dalton. 1852.

THESE are two short pamphlets; one on the Godhead of Christ, the other on eternal punishment. They are intended to oppose the truth of God to Socinian error. The author keeps fast by the written Word and "proves all things" thereby. He argues simply and clearly.

Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission, principally among the Dens of London. By R. W. VANDERKISTE. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1852.

ONE of the most intensely interesting and rousing books which we have read for many a day. It makes us ashamed of our slothfulness, and at the same time stirs us up to plead and say, "O Lord, how long;" "Make haste; renew this world of ours, for iniquity abounds."

The History of the Council of Trent. From the French of L. F. BUNGENER. Edinburgh: T. Constable and Co. 1852.

THIS volume has reached us so late that we have only had time to glance over its learned and solid pages. It seems a first-rate work.

The Beauties of the Bible, an Argument for Inspiration. In Ten Lectures. By WILLIAM LEASK. London: Partridge and Oakey. 1852.

THOUGH the diction of this volume may perhaps be blamed as over-

Digitized by Google

wrought, yet it must be recognised as a work of power, and truth, and eloquence. The sixth lecture is that which most falls within our province, and most gladly should we have made large extracts from its rich paragraphs, but our limits control us.

The Foreign Theological Review. No. I. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. May, 1852.

The design of this periodical is thus stated by the publishers. After mentioning that it is to consist of reprints of the choicest articles of foreign literature, they add:—

"The work will not be the republication of any single periodical, but a collection of the papers of highest merit in the reviews of the various denominations—an arrangement which, by securing an extensive field for selection, affords a strong additional guarantee for its high and unvarying excellence. The names of the authors will generally be given in the index to the volume; and negotiations are in progress, through which it is hoped that several of the papers will be published in the 'Foreign Evangelical Review,' and in America simultaneously."

This first number is as excellent in promise as it is in performance. Conducted well, as we know it will be, there is hardly any periodical that may be of greater service to the Church of Christ in these days, when a refined but worldly literature, a subtle but hollow philosophy, and a fresh but reckless theology are pervading our journalism and seducing thousands from the Bible and the cross.

Prophecy Interpreted Literally or Spiritually. Baltimore. 1843.

This is an American pamphlet of high excellence. It is full of plain sense and scriptural argument.

The Jew. By the author of "Both One in Christ." London: Wertheim and Macintosh. 1852.

This is the fifth edition of a most excellent and interesting work. The author has enlarged and improved the original work.

The Emphatic New Testament, &c. Edited, with an introductory essay on Greek Emphasis, by John Taylor. London: Taylor, Walton, and Maberly. 1852.

In this volume "an attempt is made to represent to the English reader certain peculiarities of expression in the Greek text, which are of too much importance to be left unnoticed." Such is the author's account of his work. Of much of it the utility is obvious, and Mr. Taylor seems to have executed his task carefully and well. Perhaps, however, he has *overdone* it, so that the reader requires so great a stretch of memory and attention to thread his way through

Digitized by Google

the complex variety of emphasis that he is apt to be fatigued and puzzled. Nevertheless, the plan is good.

Notes and Reflections on the Epistle to the Hebrews. By ARTHUR PRIDHAM. Bath: Binns and Goodwin. 1852.

WE cannot place this volume quite on a level with the author's former admirable one on the Romans, yet it does possess the same class of excellences; its criticism being of a superior order, and its success in elucidating the meaning such as makes the reader feel how truly and fully the writer has had sympathy with the apostle's spirit. We must say, however, that we are not satisfied with the statements at pp. iii and xv of the Introduction, "that the reclaimableness of fallen humanity is there assumed as the ostensible basis of God's dealings with men." We should say that this is either a *truism* or an *error*. We think there is some confusion in the author's statements as to this. Yet, discounting one or two things which we might be disposed to question or to consider *unproved*, we feel that the work is one of great value, and fitted to be of much service to the Church.

The Analytical Greek Lexicon, consisting of an alphabetical arrangement of every occurring inflexion of every word contained in the Greek New Testament Scriptures; with a grammatical analysis of every word, &c. London: Bagster and Sons. 1852.

THERE has nothing like this, we venture to say, ever been produced in the annals of Greek lexicography. It most amply bears out its title-page as "Analytical Greek Lexicon," and though, perhaps, very far advanced students may not need it, yet there are very few readers of the Greek Testament who will not experience its utility. Its elaborate minuteness is quite admirable. We may add, that it is a splendid specimen of Greek typography.

The Scottish Protestant. Glasgow: M'Phun.
The Bulwark; or, Reformation Journal. Edinburgh: Nichol.

WE most heartily commend both of these able and vigorous periodicals to the notice of our readers, and claim for them their warm support. In these days, when Popery is raging because of its losses in Ireland, and putting forth its wildest and most savage efforts to regain its ground in Britain, it becomes every true-hearted Protestant to bestir himself. There must be *Protestant aggression*, with might and main over the whole land. If the Reformation were worth the gaining, it is worth the preserving. God is manifestly favouring us at this moment, and working wonderfully in our behalf. Let us be faithful to our name, and fight the battles of the Lord with faith and zeal, and energy and prayer; all the more

Digitized by Google

that we see the day approaching, and know that Babylon's doom is at hand, and the angel's millstone ready to fall upon her.*

Man's Last History; with some Thoughts on the First Resurrection. Dublin: J. M'Glashan. 1851.

This is but a brief sketch of man's last history, but it contains much scriptural truth.

Feed My Lambs; the Young Mother's First Book. By A Mother. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1852.

We notice this well-written little work, because we see from one of its chapters that the authoress brings out, though briefly, and in a manner suitable to children, the truth of the first and second resurrections.

No Condemnation in Christ Jesus, as unfolded in the Eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. By Octavius Winslow, D.D. London: Shaw. 1852.

The eighth chapter of the Romans is very fully and excellently expounded here in a series of thirty-five chapters. Our readers will find it admirably suited for doctrine, reproof, instruction, and consolation. In the nineteenth and twentieth chapters the reader will find the author's views on the "expectation of the creature." In the main we agree with him, though we doubt his interpretation of *κτισις*.

The Mystery Solved; or, Ireland's Miseries: the Grand Cause and Cure. By the Rev. E. M. Dill. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. 1852.

The title of this book is a most appropriate one. The reader will find it just what it professes to be. It is a very able and interesting book.

Romanism at Home. By Kirwan. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. 1852.

We can do no more than merely recommend these admirable Letters to our readers.

* An excellent tract has been sent to us, entitled, "The Dissolution of Parliament; or, the Christian's Duty to his Country," &c. Wertheim and Macintosh.

Digitized by Google

Extracts.

"WITH what propriety can it be said, that some of the dead who were beheaded lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years, but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished, unless the dying and living again be the same in both places, a proper death and resurrection? If the martyrs rise only in a spiritual sense, so do also the rest of the dead; but if the rest of the dead really rise, the martyrs rise in the same manner. There is no difference between them. We should be cautious and tender of making the first resurrection an allegory, lest others should reduce the second into an allegory too."—*Bishop Newton.*

"ORIGEN confidently avows the expectation that Christianity, working outwards from within, would overcome and suppress every other religion, and gain the dominion of the world. Such an anticipation was foreign to the thoughts of the older teachers of the Church. They could conceive of the Pagan state in no other relation than one of constant hostility to Christianity, and expected the triumph of the Church only as the result of a supernatural interposition of the second coming of Christ."—*Neander*, *Church History*, vol. i., pp. 176, 177.

"WILL you hear the sum of all? Perilous times and seasons are come upon us; many are wounded already; many have failed. The Lord help us! The crown is fallen from our head, the glory of our profession is gone, the time is short, the Judge standeth before the door! Take but this one word of counsel, brethren, WATCH, that none of these things come upon you, but that ye may escape and be accounted worthy to stand before the Son of God."—*Owen.* "Sermon on 2 Tim. iii. 1."

"THE subject (which is the reign of our Saviour with his saints on earth), is of a transcendent glory in itself, of universal importance to all persons and states, and very seasonable for the present times. Like a piece of rich coin, which hath been long buried in the earth and lately dug up again, it begins to grow bright with handling, and to pass current with great numbers of saints and learned men of great authority. As the same star at different seasons is the *evening* star, setting immediately after the sun, and then the *morning* star, shining immediately before it, so was this truth the evening star to the first coming of Christ, setting together with the glory of that day in a night of Antichristianism; and now it appears again in our times, as a morning-star to that blessed day of the second effusion of the Spirit

Digitized by Google

and the second appearance of our Saviour in the glory of the Father."
—*Peter Sterry (one of the Westminster Divines)*.

"SINCE Scripture uniformly enjoins us to look with expectation to the advent of Christ, and delays the crown of glory till that period, let us be contented with the limits divinely prescribed to us, viz., that the souls of the righteous, after their warfare is ended, obtain blessed rest, where in joy they wait for the fruition of promised glory, and that thus the final result is suspended till Christ the Redeemer appear."—*Calvin's Institutes*, Book iii., ch. 25, sec. 6.

"THE princes of this world, at the instigation of that wicked and seducing spirit the Serpent, will not cease from killing and persecuting those that call on the name of Christ, till He shall come again and destroy them all and render to every man according to his deserts."—*Justin Martyr. Dial. with Trypho.* Sec. 39.

"WE should always live in expectation of the Lord Jesus in the clouds, with oil in our lamps, prepared for his coming."—*Usher.*

Correspondence.

REPLY TO STRICTURES OF "A CHRISTIAN GEOLOGIST" UPON "THE PROBABLE CREATION PLACE OF ANGELS."

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

DEAR SIR,—I fear that "A Christian Geologist" has mistaken the intended application of those passages which he considers "most objectionable" in my paper on "The Probable Creation Place of Angels," supposing, as I conclude from his context, that those words were put by me into the mouths of *Christian* geologists. But the words themselves show that this cannot have been intended, and, with Dr. Hitchcock and others, I have long considered that discoveries of modern science, if correct, so far from opposing revelation, must confirm it, inasmuch as truth cannot oppose truth, which emanates but from one fountain, and that the Divine mind. Your correspondent, however, cannot be ignorant that all geologists have not been, like himself, "Christian," nor, if common report have spoken truth, that the discoveries of that science have been perverted to shake the faith of some in the correctness of the Mosaic history. I feel much indebted to him for correcting any error into which I may fall, if it be done in a Christian spirit; and as everything connected with the history of our planet, past, present, and future, cannot fail of being interesting, I value exceedingly anything which throws light upon such a subject. In your correspondent's strictures I find the following passage:—"But some Christians are not satisfied to stop here, but they must forsooth (!) make this *addition* to the record, *by sin came also*

Digitized by Google

the death of the lower animals. Now, however, geology interferes, and with the utmost confidence, indeed, as with the voice of authority, denounces the addition as alike unwarrantable and false (!), &c., &c.," to the end of the quotation of Deut. iv. 2. In replying to this somewhat harsh stricture, I must remark that, if Romans v. 12 were the only Scripture which spoke upon the subject, the argument here adduced might be justified, though hardly, I think, the tone in which it is delivered. But when I turn to Romans viii. 18—23, the case is changed. Upon this passage I find that eminent servant of God, the late Rev. Thomas Scott, thus commenting:—"The animal tribes are subject to pain *and death* through man's sin."—*See Note in loc.* Neither do I believe that in so writing he wrote unadvisedly, but was borne out by the sacred text. In Rom. viii. 19, 20, we read, ἡ γαρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως, κ.τ.λ.

The correctness or incorrectness of Mr. Scott's view, in which I fully coincide, depends much upon the true intent of the two words κτίσις and ματαιότητι, coupled, as this last term is, with the significant and explanatory word, τῆς φθορᾶς of ver. 21. That κτίσις must intend the subordinate creation is a clear deduction from the passage, and, moreover, that it must be confined to the *animate* part of that creation, is clear also; because that only can be truly said to "groan and travail in pain together," and, therefore, the marginal translation of ver. 22 better accords with the sense of the passage, which is, "every creature" instead of "the whole creation;" for, it cannot be said, that the trees and plants groan and travail in pain together. The whole human family consists only of two sections, "the children of God," and the children of the wicked one. The children of God are clearly excluded from the term κτίσις, inasmuch as ἡ κτίσις is represented as looking out for their manifestation; and the other section of the human family must also be excluded, because the very last thing which they would desire would be "the manifestation of the children of God." The subordinate creature, therefore, alone remains to whom we can apply the term. But the Scripture states that they were made subject to vanity; and the question becomes, *what is vanity?* Schleusner says, "unus Codex *Lambecii* habet φθορα," in his comment upon the place, and that it has that meaning, is, I think, more than probable, from the use of that word, ἀπο τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς, which amounts to a synonymous expression, in the following verse, and, as I must conclude, an explanation also of ματαιότητι. If so, then the "vanity," there employed by the apostle, must include death, if it do not principally intend it.

That fossil remains of a high antiquity have been found in the crust of our globe, only proves that death has been at work here in some previous stage of its existence; but it leaves the cause of its introduction unexplained, neither shall we know these things *with certainty*, until in our future condition of perfect knowledge (1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10), doubtless we shall be made acquainted with the particulars of that state also. This, however, does not hinder us from arguing analogically from what we do know by revelation of our present condition, and of the principles of divine conduct in our case, to what may have been the effect of the same principles, operating in the ages which are past. Living, moreover, in a world, over which the sirocco blast of God's displeasure has swept, leaving upon every part of creation traces of Divine malediction, and these, the penal consequences of the sin of *one creature* only, who was the constituted head over all; and, as we have reason to believe from Rom. viii. 19—21, that death owes its universal sway to one man's disobedience, that his sin was the door by which that common enemy entered into this part of God's creation: when we find proofs of his rule in some remoter periods of this same world's story, we almost instinctively ask this question: "May not the offence of some superior intelligence have brought a corresponding judgment upon the inferior and subordinate creature existing at that time, and that then, as now, 'the creature was made subject to vanity not willingly?'" I own that I am slow to allow there is anything objectionable in this. Here I would venture to ask a question: "Can we, with the utmost confidence, say that, when the

Digitized by Google

events which are predicted (Rev. xx. 14), shall have taken place, death shall still have dominion over *any* part of the creation of God?" It must at the least be a doubtful thing; and as a clear analogy is found between the paradisaical state of our earth, and that which shall succeed the present (Gen. i. 26, 28, 31; Isa. xi. 5—9), *what reason have we* for concluding either that death, in what is called its natural course, will still retain its rule over the lower creatures in their future condition, or that it exercised it over them in the time of man's innocency? That they did not then devour each other is sufficiently clear, for "to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth (saith God), wherein there is life, *I have given every green herb for meat: and it was so.*" (Gen. i. 30.) Are we then warranted in concluding, from the scanty premises to which I have referred, that death, *divested of his penal character*, formed an original principle of that past state of being from its beginning, and that it was not rather introduced by some provoking cause, analogous to that which brought it in upon the human family in a later age, and, as we must still believe from scriptural evidence, upon "every creature made subject to vanity," and cursed because of man's sin?

"Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed *above* all cattle, and *above* every beast of the field. Cursed is the ground for thy sake. Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee." The serpent was cursed "*above all cattle,*" therefore all cattle were cursed, though in an inferior degree: a fearful type of Him who, for our sin, was made a curse for us, of which the serpent lifted up in the wilderness was the just figure! The serpent was cursed "*above every beast of the field,*" therefore every beast of the field was cursed, though in an inferior degree, yea, and the very ground upon which man trod, and all for the sin of man! I am, your fellow-servant in the Gospel,

June, 1852. ————.

Poetry.

HOW LONG!

"Behold, I make all things new."—Rev. xxi. 5.

I.

Do they still linger,—these slow-treading ages?
How long must we still bear their cold delay!
Streak after streak the glowing dawn presages;
And yet it breaks not,—the expected day!

II.

Each tossing year, with prophet-lip hath spoken,
"Prepare your praises, earth, awake and sing!"
And yet yon dome of blue remains unbroken;
No tidings yet of the descending King!

III.

Darkness still darkens; nearer now and nearer
The lightnings gleam; the sea's scorched billows moan;
And the sere leaf of earth is growing serer;
Creation droops, and heaves a bitterer groan.

Digitized by Google

IV.

O storm and earthquake, wind and warring thunder,
 Your hour is coming ;—one wild outburst more,—
One other day of war, and wreck, and plunder,—
 And then your desolating reign is o'er.

V.

These plains are not your battle-field for ever;
 That glassy deep was never made for you;
These mountains were not built for you to shiver;
 These buds are not for your rude hands to strew.

VI.

Flee and give back to earth its verdant gladness,
 The early freshness of its unsoiled dew;
Take hence your sackcloth, with its stormy sadness;
 And let these wrinkled skies their youth renew.

VII.

Give back that day of days, the seventh and fairest,
 When, like a gem new set, earth flung afar
Her glory, of creation's gems the rarest,
 Sparkling in beauty to each kindred star.

VIII.

Come back, thou holy love, so rudely banished,
 When evil came, and hate, and fear, and wrong;
Return, thou joyous light, so quickly vanished;
 Revive, thou life that death has quenched so long!

IX.

Re-fix, re-knit the chain so harshly broken,
 That bound this lower orb to yon bright heaven;
Hang out on high the ever-golden token,
 That tells of earth renewed and man forgiven.

X.

Withdraw the veil that has for ages hidden
 That upper kingdom from this nether sphere;
Renew the fellowship so long forbidden;
 O God, thyself take up thy dwelling here!

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Some articles still stand over. In answer to a correspondent we may say, that the Eleventh of Zechariah has not been expounded in our Journal. We hope to satisfy him in our next.

NOTICE.

All readers of the Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced; also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Digitized by Google

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

OCTOBER, 1852.

Art. I.—IS ROME THE BABYLON OF THE APOCALYPSE?

Part IV.

We now approach the most difficult, the most delicate, and the most dangerous part of the subject with which we have to deal. It is the most difficult, for we must now decide the precise period at which the Church of Rome became apostate, and the worship of the Virgin Queen, till then carried on in secret conventicles, superseded Christianity, as the avowed religion of the Roman empire. It is the most delicate, because the selection of any date must clash with the prejudices of some good men, since their opinions differ irreconcileably. It is the most dangerous, because, by postdating it we afford an opening of which Tractarians will not be slow to avail themselves, whilst by antedating it we may unwittingly confirm the opinions of those continental writers who deny that genuine Christianity ever was received in the Celto-Roman world, and maintain that Evangelical truth dates back only to the days of Luther, and is a mere development of the European mind.

Where Elliott and Faber and Mede directly contradict each other on a question of fact, it is certain that *two*, at least, must be partially wrong. When all three differ hopelessly from the united judgment of Beza, Sir Isaac Newton, Edward Gibbon, and Dean Waddington, confirmed by the involuntary admissions of all leading Romanists and Tractarians, as to the specific date of certain events, we may at least be pardoned if we investigate for ourselves. It is possible that each may have stated partial truth, but that the views of all must be combined to form a perfect whole.

Was it then in the fourth, the fifth, or the sixth century,

Digitized by Google

that the Church of Rome became apostate? According to the early Reformers, the Roman Church had become wholly idolatrous before the close of the *fourth* century.

Sir Isaac Newton states, the worship of saints, relics, martyrs, and of the Queen of Heaven, at the close of the fourth century, to have superseded that of Christ throughout the Roman empire.

The Dean of Durham considers the apostasy complete in A.D. 395.

By an involuntary admission, fatal to his whole theory, Dr. Cumming admits that the predominant religion of the fourth century was "*what we call Puseyism, and that the ministers of the Church having lost the light of the Sun of Righteousness, walked in paths of their own.*"

According to Romanists, the worship of Mary was enacted at the Council of Constantinople, in A.D. 391, and universally received, by the expulsion from the Church of all who refused it, in A.D. 431, when, according to the Cardinal of Lorraine and the great Romish doctors, the faith of the Church was finally established on its present footing. The disputations between them and the Reformed broke off on this very point, the Reformers refusing testimonies later than the Council of Constantinople.

Edward Gibbon considers the entire system of Virgin idolatry as established through the Roman empire in the fourth century, but that it did not obtain exclusive and unopposed possession of the Greek or eastern empire till the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431.*

Finally, Mede, a man of great learning and sagacity, as well as piety, fixes on A.D. 456, in which the Eastern Emperor recognised the Bishop of Rome, as taking in Greece precedence of the Greek bishops, as the latest to which can be attributed the setting up the abomination of desolation.

These are grave authorities not lightly to be disposed of. It might perhaps have been as well if our lamented friend, Mr. Cuninghame, of Lainshaw, instead of calculating back from the French Revolution, to find a date that would suit

* Dean Milman also considers representations of the Virgin to have been in use for worship at Rome before the Council of Ephesus, but that the type and figure which had till then varied, at that period, was then formally assimilated to that of Isis and Horus, Shemir and Bel, and proceeds to represent the divines, even of the first period, as teaching the ubiquity of the Virgin and saints, and their power to read the heart.

Basnage and most Protestant writers contend, however, that pictures of the Virgin only became common after the decision of that Council had universally established her worship.—*Milman*, vol. iii., 517—542.

Digitized by Google

his theory, had first shown that the great men we have quoted were all in error in believing the apostasy perfected more than thirteen hundred years previously. We have not yet seen their facts questioned, or their arguments disproved; but it is taken as a matter of course, that they must be wrong, because more than 1260 years have elapsed from the period they respectively specify till the French Revolution.* All of them, let it be observed, agree that the entire apostasy was completed and consummated, at the very latest about the time of that Council of Ephesus, which declared the Virgin to be "The Mother of God," the doctrine of the Millennial reign of Christ heretical, and all who refused to worship the image of its taste, or to commune with Damasus, to be expelled the Church, thus consigning the Christians of Britain and Persia to everlasting perdition.

Mr. Cuninghame, Mr. Elliott, Mr. Frere, Mr. Habershon, all count the setting up of the apostasy from a certain supposed rescript of Justinian, Emperor of Constantinople, and the Greek people, A.D. 533, by which he *recognised* the precedence of the Roman Pontiff *in the Eastern* empire, should he on any occasion visit it. We do not wait to investigate the authenticity of this letter, but are content here to accept it, as having been really sent. Yet we do not see how Justinian, who was unable to recover the Western empire for himself, could give the saints who were not under his control to the Pontiff, any more than the Emperor of China could hand them over to him now. From this letter, 1260 years are calculated by some to have elapsed till the *termination* of the reign of Terror at Paris, in 1793.

Mr. Faber and the excellent Thomas Scott contend that the rise of the apostasy must be taken from A.D. 606, when the usurper Phocas, Emperor of Constantinople and the Greeks, wrote another courteous letter to the Pontiff-King of Rome, recognising him as not only ecclesiastical chief of the Roman empire, but as also beyond the conventional limits of that empire, the first of bishops. The venerable commentator's opinion being founded on the belief, that the slaying of the two witnesses was yet future, whilst Mr. Faber speaks of them as slain in that reign of Terror, which, so far as we

* It might perhaps be worth asking, how the reign of Atheism, from 1792 to 1793, in the city of Paris, can be made out to have been the reign of Popery throughout the world; or how the political death of Popery in the French capital can be considered the slaughter of the Witnesses of Christ at Jerusalem. Truly Paris has never much resembled Jerusalem yet.

Digitized by Google

believe, did not affect even one Christian, must be taken as standing upon its own merits. He affords no sufficient reasons for his choice of dates, except that the 1260 years not having run out in his time, as he supposed, must be dated from a comparatively late period.

Bishop Newton, again, goes farther, and boldly cuts away all difficulties, by making the acceptance of the civil sovereignty of the Roman states in A.D. 757, by the Pope as the commencement of his reign as Antichrist. This epoch has, at least, the merit of being clear and undisputed, and of being fixed on a positive event, not a mere letter, the very existence of which is doubted by many, and which produced no result.

Here, then, we have two distinct schools of interpreters, differing from each other on the average, by at least *one hundred and fifty years*, as to the period when the Church of Rome departed from the faith.

Now it is worthy of remark, that if Mede, or Elliott, or Faber, or any of the second class, be correct, the conversion of the Christian Bishop of Rome into the Antichrist, was the result of a protocol with a *foreign* prince, having in Justinian's case little, in Phocas no power whatever in the Roman world, but merely recognising and admitting claims already made and powers for long in exercise;—a letter so obscure in either case, that the fact of its existence has been denied, and was never thought of by Romanists or Protestants until the result of the French Revolution induced the latter to look out for some event occurring 1260 years before that period. It is truly remarkable that nothing important should have occurred between the years A.D. 529 and 533, except this letter from Justinian, a Greek emperor, then seeking to obtain temporary military occupation of a part of Italy, and recognising the existing authorities, whom he had not power to displace. How much better Mr. Elliott's theory would appear if he could show that, in A.D. 533, the Christian Bishop of Rome entered upon and accepted the office of Heathen Pontiff, and, as such, licensed the worship of the Virgin Goddess. Much better still, if it had occurred in 527, so as to make the 1260 days end at the commencement, rather than the middle, of the French Revolution.

But it will be said, these questions are more curious than valuable. All admit the Church of Rome to have become apostate by A.D. 606, and to have ever since continued apostate. Why inquire into her earlier history?

Digitized by Google

We would ask, in reply, whether, in establishing a commission of lunacy, there is no importance in deciding the time when the patient became lunatic. If he has made away large estates yet recoverable without consideration, if he has committed countless crimes, if he has brought false accusations against his brethren, perilling their homes, and endangering their lives, is it nothing to show that these things were all subsequent to his lunacy, that the estates may be regained, the family homes saved, and the charges so falsely made at once disposed of?

Let us see how commonly received theories have actually operated. How the attempt to make the Pope not only head of the apostate Church, but also *the* one last Antichrist, has produced the fearful reaction of the last ten years in favour of Popery. If the Pope is proved not to be, as Bishop Newton asserts, the one *Only* Antichrist, then will not some lean to the opposite conclusion, that Rome is not Babylon, and that neither Rome nor the Pope are denounced by the Spirit of God?

Mr. Froude, Mr. Newman, and Dr. Pusey, were all brought up firm believers in Mr. Faber and Bishop Newton. They held that the Pope was and had been for the last 1260 years the Man of Sin, and the Beast of the Revelation, and yet a Christian bishop, in the same way that Judas was an apostle till he betrayed his Lord. Their feelings, as Englishmen,* revolted at his assumptions. They disliked the coarseness of the Irish priesthood. They anxiously sought, therefore, evidence from the Primitive Church, to show the novelty of their claim. They found ample proof of the independence of the *Greek* Church at all times, and of stern resistance offered to the Pontiff, when he strove to extend his ecclesiastical jurisdiction beyond the limits of the Latin empire. But they also found that these great doctors, Basil and Chrysostom, Cyril and the Gregories, and even Jerome, held all Romish doctrine, save the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, over themselves: that they differed from him as little as Bishop Onderdank, of New York, from Bishop Philpotts, of Exeter, and that, whilst denying his claim to cite any but Roman citizens into his ecclesiastical courts, they never questioned his lawful pontificate amongst his own people. Hence, then, as most modern prophetic commentators are forced, in accordance with these schools, to fix the apostasy in the sixth century, and the religion of the sixth century

* We should correct ourselves. Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, and Lord Feilding are not of British but of German blood.

Digitized by Google

differed in no one respect for the worse from that of the fifth, but was rather improved by the Gothic conquest, it seemed strange that the same Bishop and Church of Rome which, up to A.D. 533, was, according to Milner and Scott, a Christian Church, should be converted into *the* apostasy, by a simple letter from a foreign king, acknowledging the powers that the Bishop had possessed for at least a century, and recognising him as a member of the same Church. No change, no alteration of doctrine, or discipline, or practice, was ever dreamed of. It was naturally argued by such acute logicians, (for they are acute logicians,)—Can Mastai Ferretti be, in 1850, considered Antichrist, because he teaches that the Virgin Mother is the sole fountain of grace?—whilst Damasus, who first forced the Church to worship *the Mother of the Gods*, is to be held a saint, because he lived thirteen hundred years since, and before the commencement of the supposed 1260 years? If after the Council of Ephesus, the worship of dead men, relics, and martyrs, and of the Queen of Heaven, became universal, and the worshippers were not apostate, then what right have we to consider their successors apostate now? Mr. Elliott, Mr. Faber, and Mr. Habershon, all admit the Basils, the Gregorys, Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, to be saints! Can we, therefore, err in believing what these great men believed? Such are the arguments to which we owe the fearful perversion of a large part of the Anglican Church.

The truth is, as Isaac Taylor well observes, that we must stand upon Scripture alone, or take the authority of the apostate Church, in all its extents. There is no medium. Either the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, Augustine excepted, were apostates, endeavouring to combine the worship of the female principle with the Mediator, or, if they really understood Scripture, and had the mind of the Spirit, Luther and Cranmer, Calvin and Knox, Baxter and Bunyan, Gustavus and Cromwell and Coligni, Whitfield and Toplady, Cecil and Chalmers, are wholly wrong; and Bonner, Dominic, and Loyola, and Torquemada, wholly right. On this subject there can be no mistake. It comes to the simple issue, are we, or are we not, to be saved, either by our own abstinence from marriage, as monks, or, if we choose to live as we list, after passing through purgatorial fires, to be pardoned by mercy of the Mother of God, purchased by payment to her priesthood, who, by perpetual virginity, have won the favour of their Virgin Queen? Or is it by free grace of God, through Christ alone, by sanctification through his Spirit?

Digitized by Google

Is God our reconciled Father through Christ, or is he our angry foe, who only shows mercy,—we shudder at the blasphemy,—at the intercession of his earthly bride? But there was another step. These men then proceeded to ask themselves further questions. If these doctrines we have now received are true, are they the whole truth? In what do the doctrines of the Council of Ephesus differ from the Roman now? If Celestine and Damasus and Ambrose and Basil and Jerome were saints, Ignatius Loyola, and the Saxon traitor, Thomas a'Becket, were saints too, and of a yet higher order in the Church.

Does the faith or practice of Dr. Mastai Ferretti differ in any one point from that of St. Damasus, that we, who agree in all respects with Damasus, should differ from him?

Such was the train of reasoning which passed through the mind of Ward, of Newman, and of Manning; nor can we acquit writers like Scott and Faber and Milner, great and holy as they are, from having let in the flood of evil, by their toleration of the apostacy in its earlier form. We see the results.*

Let us now look for ourselves, and, without regard to any theory, examine when and how the Romish Church, already in part perverted, consummated its apostacy, and abandoned itself to another husband than its Lord. We are with grief compelled to go very far back in the history of that Church.

In A.D. 376, *seven jubilees* after the ascension of our Lord —we request attention to this date—the Emperor Gratian† ascended the Imperial throne, elected emperor by the soldiers; he was also chosen Pontiff by the priests. Instead of acquitting his conscience, like his father, by appointing a Heathen *locum*

* The thoughts described here have passed through the mind of the writer as well. He is compelled to confess that he began his researches with extreme High Church sympathies, and anxious to find patristic support. It was only by investigating for himself he discovered that these pretended champions of the faith were but traitors in disguise; and that, like the Irish Roman Catholic militia, at the battle of Castlebar, they were formidable only to those who put trust in them. He soon found himself compelled to choose between the unmixed Word of God and the almost unmixed falsehoods of those wicked men, who, with all deceivableness of naughtiness lay in wait to ensnare the early Church, and infused disease into its veins, from which even we have not yet been wholly delivered.

† He had, whilst a mere child, been appointed by his father co-emperor, in order to secure his succession; but it was in A.D. 376, that, on the death of Valentian his father, he became *sovereign*, and could act for himself. Till then he enjoyed *brevet* rank only. We mention this, that no question may arise as to the date given, some writers calculating his reign, like that of Charles II. and Louis XVIII., from its nominal commencement.

Digitized by Google

tenens, to discharge its duties in his name, as the Archbishop of Canterbury appoints the Judge of the Arches Court, he, whilst accepting the office, and thus preventing its being filled up, refused to attire himself in pontifical vestments, or to adopt the curule chair, the ivory sceptre, the fan-bearing followers, and the other badges of the pontificate, or to perform its duties. The whole ecclesiastical system was thus paralysed. There no longer remained any tribunal capable of deciding matters of trust, mistake, fraud, conscience, for arranging the affairs of charities, or for settling religious endowments, Jew, Christian, or Pagan. No dispute between the members of any religious sect could now be heard or satisfied. Ecclesiastical affairs must have become inextricably confused, and the whole business of life disorganized. It became necessary to elect not a merely spiritual head of the Christian Church, but an ecclesiastical chief from the Roman people.

Two parties were recommended to the Emperor for the high priesthood, Symmachus, the Prince of the Senate, and acting Pontiff under Valentinian; and St. Damasus, the then Bishop of Rome.

Who was this Damasus, and what were his pretensions, and what his character?

He was put forward in A.D. 366, as candidate for the Bishopric of Rome by the Assyrian and Egyptian Monks of Mount Carmel, who must have come over for that purpose. These monks claim to have been founded by Elijah, and to have been handed down through the captivity. They were more likely a relic of Jezebel's Babylonian prophets. However this may be, we know that, in the days of Vespasian, they worshipped the Assyrian Mother of the gods, under the name of Barbelo; that they have at all times been marked by the Holy See as the peculiar votaries of the Virgin Mary, whose nearest relatives they assert were members of their order; that they teach community of goods, fasting, flagellation, filthiness, and celibacy, although not famed for chaste conduct, and that a fouler set of fanatics never existed. We know that a Basilides, whom there is reason to believe was also the Basilides, that arch-heretic, of whom we have spoken, was the head of their order. These men put forward their friend Damasus as candidate for the Bishopric of Rome. The mob followed Pretextatus, the High Priest of Isis, who had succeeded in combining the followers of Isis and Cybele, under him, and was all-powerful in Rome. The secret brotherhoods seem to have supported Damasus. The autho-

Digitized by Google

rities were passive. The genuine Christians alone opposed. Their opposition was soon settled, and *a few Carmelites, with yataghans under their cassocks,* were quite sufficient to decide the election at each church. Their predecessors had been equally active in support of the Jewish Pharisees. In two churches opposition was offered, and nearly three hundred Christians, many of them females, lay in a few moments weltering in their gore, in the presence of Damasus, whilst not a Carmelite was scathed.* A police will never act against an armed people, with whom *any of the authorities sympathize.* A Bishop of Rome was chosen, approved both by Pagan and Carmelite. Are we to infer nothing from this?

Yet St. Damasus felt deeply the peril he might incur if summoned before a sterner sovereign. The Carmelites and the genuine Christians, and the devoted Isis worshippers, from different causes, felt themselves in danger, whilst the same person was at once military and ecclesiastical chief. If the Pontiff was a Heathen, what could prevent an Emperor in want of troops drafting twenty thousand vagrant monks into his legions? The Pagans also sought to revive the ancient constitution of the empire, and deemed that, by separating the

* Saint Damasus was generally accused of devoting what of his time could be spared from political intrigue to the bath, the banquet, and the boudoir of wanton beauty. Such was the excessive luxury in which, even before becoming Pontiff he revelled, that his friend, the Heathen General-in-Chief and Premier, expressed his readiness to renounce Heathenism too, for so gorgeous a position. That Damasus, however, was guilty of actual vice has not been proved, for the proceedings against him for immoralities broke down, as well as those for murder. That men should have provoked the vengeance of one so powerful and so vindictive, by indicting him, proves that they at least thought him guilty: that the tribunals, venal as they were, thought the charge insufficiently proved, should make us in charity doubt. Yet the fact that he was acquitted for those murders, to which none dispute his privity, may make us suspend our judgment upon his freedom from other accusations. He was, probably, neither worse nor better than the rest of the monks, who seem to have done nothing but bask at the feet of wealthy ladies, and inflict on them flagellation and fasting, whilst feasting at their expence. That they were introduced by Damasus is evidenced by his friend Jerome's statement, that Marcella, their acquaintance and dupe, and paymistress, was the first Roman lady perverted, by their instrumentality, to become a nun. Surely it may be questioned whether the heathenism of Fabricius and Regulus was less respectable than the blasphemous apostacy of Jerome and Damasus, who pretended to be ministers of Christ. Luther's saying with regard to Jerome's religious character, is well known. Yet Luther and all the Reformers blindly accepted Jerome's daring inventions as to the fulfilment of past prophecies, without ever examining how far those fulfilments were facts, or forgeries to favour the claims of an apostate priesthood.

Digitized by Google

control of religion and the decision of right and wrong from the conduct of military affairs, as in the old republic, they might yet save Rome, and, by a balance of power, restrain the excesses of an uncontrolled despotism. Their united wish was granted. *In* A.D. 378 *Damasus was declared Pontifex Maximus.* We have before shown the powers of the Pontiff, King of the sacrifices, Master of the dispensation. All these were now given to Damasus. He had only to worship Maia, under the name of the Mother of our Lord, and to call her child, Horus, Bacchus, Creeshna, by the name of Christ.

By the Imperial rescript, conferring the pontificate, it is declared that the new high priest of religion shall be sole judge of religious matters, and that sacred things shall only be decided by priests. The entire ecclesiastical, including what we call Chancery, tribunals of *the empire* were thus placed under a Pontiff, and he became ecclesiastical head of the empire, enjoying this additional privilege, that no minister or person in his employ could be tried by any civil tribunal, for any offence whatever, without his consent.* Let us, for a moment, suppose that the Lord Chancellorship and all the Ecclesiastical Judgeships of Great Britain, with personal inviolability for himself and all persons acting under his orders, and the exclusive patronage of all charities, Church or Dissenting preferments, and inferior Judgeships, were granted to the Archbishop of Canterbury and his successors, with an actual *veto* on all Acts of Parliament, and power to pardon or excuse any person he pleased for any breach of law, and that the right were given him of tolerating or not tolerating any teaching he pleased in the State, the publication of any sentiment he disapproved being made a crime. Would not the Archbishop of Canterbury become then the real sovereign of the empire? These powers, however, were strictly limited to the Roman world. In the Eastern empire the Pontiffs' edicts did not run any more than those of the Judge of the Arches Court into Scotland now.

Saint Damasus was not slow to exercise his office, nor to reward those Carmelites who had supported him.

His first step was to nominate fresh Ecclesiastical Judges in every district of the Roman Empire as vicars, but, instead of Imperial Vicars, they were now called Vicars-Apostolic, superseding the old men who, having been appointed by the

* This edict will be found set out in the Appendix to the "Theodosian Code, XVII. to XX." It is unfortunate for Mr. Elliott that it does not bear date A.D. 533.

Digitized by Google

Emperor, would naturally lean to him. Claiming, therefore, uncontrolled authority in matters of religion, he still towards the Church continued to act as First Bishop. As Pontiff he could exercise uncontrolled power in the election of bishops. He did not, therefore, interfere with their immediate spiritual duties, provided they became his political tools; but whilst as Bishop he ruled the professing Christians, as Pontiff he punished those who refused to conform to his laws.

This point once accomplished, his next was to avail himself of those powers to enforce the worship of the Mother of God. The details of this period are scanty. We can only *prove* that the formal recognition of this worship and the ejectment from the Eastern Church of all who refused it, in A.D. 431, was based upon the reported decision of Damasus, as Pontiff, in A.D. 381, when he is stated to have enforced it throughout his Pontificate.*

We find, then, that the Virgin Mary was, in A.D. 381, worshipped as the Mother of God; in other words, that the doctrine, till now taught in secret, of salvation by a woman who should bruise the serpent's head, might be publicly avowed and combined with that of Christ. The conspiracy of Ammonius, of Basil, of Clement, and of Origen, was now at length successful; and, in place of a banished Saviour, was set up the image which causeth to jealousy of the Babylonian harlot, the apostacy of Samaria, Sodom, and Egypt. The same figure, form, and feature, were in all respects retained. The golden hair and Chaldæan form which marked that blue-eyed beauty, so unlike the graver and darker features of the genuine Hebrew maiden, the peculiar robe, the lotos ornament, the eight-pointed cross, and all the Boodhist symbols of Isis and Horus, Doorga and Krishna, intelligible only to the initiated, were simply wondered at by the ignorant Christian, who had no more idea of the real meaning than many of the Puseyites have now of the secret signification of the symbols they admire. It was this very fact which first drew the attention of the present writer to the subject, and the exact resemblance of the Roman Goddess to the Babylonian Harlot, as shown on the cylinders and terra-cotta figures found at Babylon by Sir R. Ker Porter, which in early boyhood gave him the first clue to his present researches. The worship of the Virgin was everywhere set up. The Heathen temples were re-edified, their ritual restored. One point alone was insisted on, that the many-named goddess should be called Mary, the name by which

* See Bower, "Lives of the Popes," article, Damasus.

Digitized by Google

she was everywhere known to the initiated in the mysteries. They gladly accepted their own secret creed. They had long known Minerva, Diana, Ceres, Venus, Proserpine, Hecate, were all different names for the same false mediatrix.

Prior to A.D. 383 no Christian had been, so far as we know, persecuted by a Christian bishop, for the simple reason that it depended upon the Imperial Pontiff to decide what was true or false, and the power of the bishop was that only of opinion. We now find Damasus act on his own authority. Jovinian, Vigilantius, and others, are startled at the charges introduced by Damasus and his secretary, Jerome. They protest against them. They insist on the literal resurrection of the body, as distinguished from the merely spiritual immortality of the soul inculcated by the Chaldean worship and the mysteries of Isis, and taught by Jerome and Damasus. They reject the worship of dead men. They deny human merit. Their opposition is at once crushed. The Imperial tribunals are not even open to them,—the scourge, starvation, and solitary confinement, by order of the Pontifical authorities, alone afford reply. But defeat of Jovinian and Vigilantius alone was insufficient. It became necessary to force out of the Church all who held the literal meaning of Scripture, all who had not been initiated into the pseudo-masonry of Origen and Clement, all opposed to union of the mysteries of Isis with the worship of Christ.

But this was not all. We find that to carry out the worship of "the Mother of the gods," it became necessary to expel the orthodox from the Church altogether. Hence we find Jerome, Damasus, and Basil, and all their friar associates, now teaching a merely spiritual heaven of eternal idleness, precisely similar to that of the mysteries of Eleusis, instead of a regenerated universe, where men should labour for the glory of their Lord. The orthodox opposed. They declared their hope that the Lord would return and reign. Damasus decided that the reign of the saints had begun already. He now formally declared the Millenarians heretical. He expelled them from the Church. His courts everywhere decided against them. None were left, save those that worshipped the Virgin Queen, and desired not that Christ would return in the flesh. Boodhism and the Babylonian worship took the place of Christianity, and the old Chaldæan creed became the established religion of the people, as it had for six centuries been the secret faith of the aristocracy of Rome. And all the customs and all the

Digitized by Google

ceremonies were introduced too. They were not invented; they were only revived and proclaimed.

This was achieved craftily. The majority of professing Christians still hoped for our Lord's return. Apollinaris, then leader, enjoyed vast weight in the Church. A charge was brought against him by Damasus, that he had incautiously denied, by implication, that the Son of God derived his proper human soul from his mother, and with holding that his Spirit was wholly Divine, and was in no degree derived from his earthly parent.

No proof of this was pretended, either against him or his immediate friends, but it was shown that some obscure European congregations, with whom he had no personal intercourse, but who, it is inferred, as Millenarians, sympathized in other respects with him, had adopted these views, and it was inferred, therefore, by the Pontiff, that he was heretical in the faith. As well might Dr. Chalmers be convicted of heresy upon proof that his former assistant, Edward Irving, had departed from the truth. Even Bower, the Jesuit, Secretary to the Inquisition, admits that nothing except his Millenarianism was *proved* against Apollinaris; that he denied all other heresy, and rejected the charges brought. Yet the Pontiff condemned him as a heretic, and delivered over to Satan, with curses, and excommunicated the most exemplary divine, the first theologian, and the most distinguished confessor under Julian the Apostate, and with him all the other Millenarians of his age, upon what we must regard as a false charge of considering our Lord's soul as swallowed up in his eternal Godhead, and of holding that He derived only his material nature from his mother. Thus all the Millenarian element was expelled the Church. Nor do we wonder at this. We are no defenders of Apollinaris; but before we condemn as heretical a man of blameless life, who had renounced all worldly prospects and suffered the loss of all things gladly for Christ's sake, upon the decision of an ungodly Pope, let us at least have some proof of his heresy. At present we have no more evidence of it than of the Romish charge of Mahometanism against Calvin, or necromancy against Luther. The real truth seems to be, that Apollinaris, dreading the prevailing tendency to identify the Virgin Mary with the "Mother of God," may have used strong language to show that our Lord derived from her only his manhood. Nor should we lightly condemn him, even if in excess of zeal he dwelt almost exclusively on Christ as the Son of God, who had taken upon himself human flesh, and

Digitized by Google

regarded Him as a Priest, King, and Conqueror, rather than as the babe who must obey its mother's will. We charge the Church of Rome with foul calumny, and of having availed itself of false charges against their leader to force from the Church those who, loving their Lord, looked for his return, and refused to recognise, in the revelry of Damasus and the priesthood, the establishment of the true Jerusalem, the Millenarian reign of the saints.

Are Gibbon, Beza, Dean Waddington, and Milman, who have no theory to support, wrong in their facts? Would Mr. Elliott himself use the Creed of St. Basil, or subscribe to the Councils of Constantinople or Ephesus? Let him even show that any change in conduct, condition, or character, in the Romish Church, appeared in or about the latter period, or that since the final settlement of its faith by the Council of Ephesus it has not been the great Anti-church, the synagogue of Satan, or that its doctrines, as generally taught and held, have been in one iota worsened.*

We have bestowed much time on the study of Damasus, but it is the turning point of Church history. Damasus was not destined to effect all these changes without opposition.

God had prepared a refuge for his elect. The messenger of mercy on the whole earth had now fulfilled his mission, and the rider on the red horse now came forth to strike down those who had denied and departed from their Lord. Are we wrong, then, in considering that this period on which we have now to enter, the Gothic invasion, is that of the second seal, extending from the rise of Popery, in

* Many readers will say, how is it that these facts have never yet been put forward? Our reply is simple,—High Churchmen could not use them because they would have invalidated the authority of those Fathers and Councils on which they depend for their best arguments against Puritanism. The Puritans averted their eyes from facts which interfered with their theory that the Pope was the only Antichrist, and that his existence was limited to 1,260 years. Evangelicals have, for the most part, been compelled merely to use the materials already collected by Mede or Gibbon; and, to say truth, have been marvellously afraid of stepping beyond beaten tracts. No country pastor can have access to such abundant materials as those stored up in the British Museum; and not many, even there, know how to find those materials. Yet all we have said will be found implied by Edward Gibbon, although his anxiety to present a picture causes him to darken details; and it is only by examining writers of an opposite tendency, less deeply imbued with Infidel teaching, that we find how very partial and incomplete are his views. They are capital pictures, but nothing like the truth they are intended to represent. They are simply the reflection of truth from the distorting mirror of Edward Gibbon's brain.

Digitized by Google

A.D. 376, to the final establishment of the first permanent Gothic monarchy in A.D. 719.

We have already remarked that Paganism fell exactly seven jubilees from our Lord's ascension; the new apostacy took nearly seven years to develop itself fully; and that, although with the abolition of Paganism the triumph of Christianity wholly ceased, two years at least elapsed before even the manifestation of the new Anti-church. This fact is important, for it enables us to see that the coincidence is not an arbitrary one. We do not draw the line in the midst of a series of similar events, but between two series of exactly opposite character at the very moment when one fell and two full years before the other begins. The rider on the white horse has taken his way through the world, announcing his message of mercy. He now was succeeded by the rider on the red horse, with *a great sword,* who, like his predecessor, was to pass through and smite down the apostates from the Lord for seven jubilees.

Now, what is the hieroglyphic meaning of this seal,—"And there went out another horse that was red: and power was given to him that sat there to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill each other: and there was given unto him a great sword?" (Rev. vi. 4.)

The word here used for sword is *romphaia,* coupled with *megale,* marking the weapon of the horsemen as of unusual size.

Now, the sword worn by the Romans is always called in Scripture the machœra; it had a straight two-edged brass, or, latterly, when brass could not be procured, iron blade, twenty-five inches in length, by about two and a quarter across the shoulder, intended either to cut in sunder a pike-shaft or to drive its point through a leathern cuirass by main force. The Greek sword, on the contrary, was called herpe, —the modern concave-bladed yataghan of the Albanians and French trailleurs. The Persian convex scimitar is called acinaces. The long straight sword, or "romphaia," was used only by the Goths and by the Wahabec Arabs. But even here there was a distinction,—the romphaia of the Arab was what is also distinguished in Scripture as the romphaia with *two edges,* a weapon of exquisite temper and of such extreme thinness as to vibrate like the bulrush as it whistled through the air. Its stroke, combining as it does the maximum of weight with the minimum of resistance, inflicts the most fearful wounds it is possible to conceive. In the defeat of Peyronnet Thompson's people, and the charge in the

Digitized by Google

65th and Artillery, at Ras El Khyma, in 1821, by the Beniboeelli, the forearms of the English were cut off even after they had delivered their bayonet thrusts. The weapon here spoken of is, however, the great, or broad-sword, the pallask of the Scandinavians, a long straight sword, with a thick back, adapted to point or parry,—a weapon formidable from its length and weight, its use depending on development of the flexor muscle, adapted only to very tall and athletic men, and useless to Oriental races. Hence, then, we conceive the rider comes from the north, just as, if he had worn the curved sabre, we should have considered the emblem as eastern; or, if the yataghan, then a Greek invader. Add to these, that the first rider having proceeded from the eastern side of the throne, it is but natural to suppose that the next of the four would go forth from the northern side.*

Now, how far will this explanation of the seal accord with history?

Up to A.D. 376, the boundaries of the Greek and Roman Empires remained unchanged, their nationalities unaltered, their civil, ecclesiastical, and military organizations uninterfered with.

In that year the medals struck by Gratian declared that the new dispensation and the reign of the saints had then commenced. Almost the same moment the Goths were allowed to cross the Danube and peacefully settle in the Greek Empire. Here, then, we have the precise date of the final triumph of the Gospel nationally confessed.

In A.D. 378 the Gothic chiefs were cut off by Greek craft. Their romphaias revenged the yataghan, and never ceased to strike till 719, seven jubilees from the new dispensation announced by Gratian's medals, when the first Gothic kingdom established in Europe freed itself from foreign control. During that period every inch of the Roman and Greek and Persian world was passed over by the romphaia-bearing

* It is worthy of remark, that, as observed by Mr. Govett, the beast which is wounded to death is pierced by the *machœra* of the Romans, not struck by the *romphaia* of the Jews and Europeans. Nor is it a thing entirely to be slighted, that all the Roman Catholic nations have recently reverted to the Roman machœra for their infantry, and that the fearful fight of Paris in 1848, as well as much of the fighting at Rome, was decided by it, whilst English, Swedes, Dutch, Danes, and Hanoverians, refuse its adoption; and we believe in our service it is worn only by the pioneers of the 52d. On the other hand, all Scandinavian and Teutonic nations stick to the romphaia, whether as broadsword, claymore, cutlass, or pallash. The Sclavonians, again, prefer the crooked scimitar.

Digitized by Google

warriors. Those whom the Goths slew not the Arab slaughtered. Whilst Rome and Greece groaned under the Gothic, Asia and Africa writhed beneath the Arab sword. Not a dynasty exists, not a constitution remains, and scarce a family can trace its pedigree beyond the close of this second seal of war and blood. Everywhere war, unceasing war, public and private war, fought with the sword, not with missiles, not by manœuvres, but by the struggle of man with man. The romphaia decided everything. We find no exceptions; everywhere the ancient rulers are overthrown and new aristocracies formed, from the conquerors of the north and east, till, in 719, the Arab war slowly begins to recoil before the Gothic chivalry.

Does not this afford a more literal and natural explanation of this seal than the girding with a little four-inch dress-dirk a Prætorian prefect or two, whose total wars probably did not cost one-third the loss sacrificed at Chalons alone, or in any of a hundred other conflicts during this period? Is it in anywise strained or unnatural? Are we wrong, then, in considering that this period which we are now discussing is that of the second seal?

Damasus was not destined to effect all his changes without opposition.

God had willed that Britain should form a rallying point. No race which gave itself to the harlot of Babylon has ever had a great effusion of God's Spirit; those who loved Christ were preserved by Him in the hour of temptation.

We have already observed that the mountain districts of Britain, inhabited by what Hamilton Smith distinguishes from the Britons and Irish, as the Celto-Semitic race, held a *quasi* independence, and that there is every reason to believe, under Caractacus, they had embraced the Gospel very early. That they had been converted by Jews we have already shown, by their refusal to partake of things strangled, and of blood, injunctions trampled on by the Church of Rome, as well as by their keeping the Passover and not the Heathen festival of Isis, now called Easter. They were still proud of their victories under Constantine, and had increased rapidly in wealth and power; and entertained now nothing but dislike and contempt for Rome. Not a single Roman appears at this time to have dared set foot across the Severn or west of Gloucester, except as a guest.

Amongst these resided a dismissed old general, Maximus, the Changarnier of the period. He had married a native lady, and had settled in Cardiganshire, where he was safe

Digitized by Google

from imperial jealousy. Here he lived his time, and watched the movements of Gratian and Damasus.

Whether Damasus did or did not attempt to send Roman priests across the Severn, we know not; but we do know that the Welsh would take no part in his councils; that they rejected his jurisdiction; that they set the Emperor also at defiance; and that the moment he sent out his vicars they poured down upon London; there they were joined by the Scotch and the other Britons, and the combined force, 130,000 strong, led by Maximus, passed over the Channel and claimed universal empire for the Pendragon of Britain. France submitted; Spain was conquered chiefly by Scottish valour; Northern Italy yielded; Germany was subdued, her troops surrendering, were enrolled in the army of the conqueror.

Scarcely had Maximus declared himself Emperor, when disputes began. A swarm of Eastern monks spread themselves through Gallia; of these a portion, named Priscilianists, half Arian, half Socialist, in creed, went even beyond the Romanists, and drew some of the clergy into their contentions and treason. They preached community of goods, abstinence from marriage and military service, and divers restrictions on others which they did not practise themselves. They were charged with vices most scandalous. If the Government had not investigated, fathers and husbands would have summarily chastised them. These men were proceeded against for offences, *contra bonos mores*, by the parties they had injured, before the common law judges, in the usual way. The immediate fact proved was that of filthy and indecent exposure in the midst of a multitude of young females. They pleaded privilege, as sacred persons, for this. The Courts rejected the plea. The Pontiff stepped in. He contended that the Emperor had no right to make that an offence which he, the Pontiff, had not proclaimed such, and that he alone had the right to decide whether priests ought or ought not to pray naked in public. These men, although not members of the Catholic Church, be it observed,—not in communion with her, could only be tried by the pontifical tribunals. Maximus was firm; the criminal law took its course; and for this his character has been blackened for fifteen centuries. The priestly hypocrites, St. Martin and Sulpitius Severus, the men who had handed over God's saints to the rack, the scourge, and solitary starvation, became enraged that a Sovereign should presume to decide upon the propriety or impropriety of the conduct of ecclesiastics. Their reclamations were loud and incessant. If Maximus is to

Digitized by Google

blame at all, we must blame him for excess of mildness. Had he driven across the Rubicon all the hired spies of Rome, and declared that no Italian foreigner should moil or meddle within his dominions, he would have done well. If he had marched on Rome, driven out the usurper, and proclaimed the right of every Church to manage its own affairs, and of every Christian to serve God according to his own conscience, without any foreign intrusion, he would have done still better.

At the same time we must, in fairness, admit, that, according to the letter of the law, Damasus was right. The Roman Pontiff, Christian or Heathen, had the legal right of deciding all ecclesiastical causes in the Roman Empire. But Maximus might argue very well, that as the Pontiff had never possessed any right, title, power, or dominion beyond the Severn or the Tweed, that the Welsh, or, as they were then called, the Picts, and Scotch had not come down from their hills to receive those laws from Damasus which they had refused from Cæsar. The question had now become national. The Church and the Latin-speaking population clung to the Pontiff; the Cymri and Scandinavian adhered to their Emperor; and the Emperor acted according to the laws of the Scandinavians and the Cymri.

The Pontiff, however, was sorely perilled. He was not slow in seeking revenge. If the few real Christians were opposed, the Arians might help him. Defeated in the attack of Constantinople by a body of Arab mercenaries, who always fight well behind walls, the revolted Goths only sought new countries to plunder. The Eastern Emperor gladly employed them to conquer the West. The Pontiff opened for them the passes of the Apennines and the Alps. They poured like an avalanche into the Empire, sweeping over every obstacle. Cut off by an irruption of these savages from his main body, and with only German troops near him, Maximus perished. Resistance then ceased. Conan ap Meriadwr, commanding the British army of the Rhine, fell back upon Bretagne and La Vendée, where the nature of the ground helped him to hold his own against the Gothic horse, and where the descendants of his soldiers have ever since remained the sole conservative link in French society. There they held their own. The rest of Europe submitted tamely. The estates of the Roman nobles were divided by the conquerors. Yet they mixed not with the people; unlike the Romans, who, despising the female as a mere toy, everywhere intermixed with and became absorbed by the people, the Goths proudly

Digitized by Google

refused to marry except with the daughters of the noble, and thus the two races continued to dwell amid each other till the revolution of 1787; and the nobles, then golden-haired, blue-eyed, tall and slight, stood distinguished from the shorter, darker, and more sharp-visaged Celtic people.

Now the result of this was to force both Celt and Roman into union. A conspiracy had been formed amongst the worshippers of the false Messiah, Bacchus, Mithra, or Nimrod, for the total overthrow of the system of compromise, which had converted Isis and Horus into the Virgin and Christ. This conspiracy now had to assume another form, that of a Celtic or democratic union against the Gothic conquerors; and the progress of this conspiracy through Carbonarism, Gnosticism, the Knights Templars, and Illuminatism, till fully developed into the order of Mizraim, we shall have to trace at some future day, showing that there exists a latent power in the Church of Rome in her, but not of her, which may at any time throw off even the mask of outward piety she still retains. But enough of this,—the question now became one not of Catholic, Donatist, or Meletian, Isis worshipper, or believer in Mithra or Bacchus; all men and creeds were alike cut up and trampled on, and Roman and Celt gradually formed themselves into the modern nationalities of Europe, writhing and struggling against the higher intellect and greater mental energy by which they were subdued.

The remark that the people of every kingdom differ much, the aristocracy little, except where, as in Spain, they have degenerated by intermarrying too closely, is true. In Europe there are many races, but, except in Britain and Hungary and the west of France, the ruling caste is everywhere the same. Perhaps Poland may be an exception, but of this we are not sure. Thus, then, was prepared that struggle between aristocracy and democracy which was destined to convulse the world, and from which England, the most aristocratic of all, has alone escaped, the conquerors not having brought wives with them, and having been therefore forced to become, in every sense of the word, *Britons*.

The defeat of Maximus produced disastrous consequences here. The Roman colonists, who in our early histories are confounded with the genuine Britons, revolted against the Silurians. Gothic troops came to help. The Welsh and Scotch, exhausted with their expedition under Maximus, were more than half paralyzed. Their chief, true to that tendency in human nature which makes man seek his oppo-

Digitized by Google

site, became enamoured of a fair Saxon beauty, and betrayed his people.

Reverting to the proceedings of the Papacy, however, we find that the Pontiff had now before him scenes of fearful peril. His great point was to enforce that first principle of Isis worship, celibacy. Without this the priests would everywhere become national, not Roman, and might, as in England they did, form the connecting link between the northern conqueror and his conquered people, and bring them into amity. So long as the empire had but one military chief there had been less fear. This unholy scheme he pursued. According to his successor, Siricius, the Holy Spirit of God could dwell only in holy bodies; therefore he who married, voluntarily parted with the Holy Spirit conferred by the hands of the Pontiff at his ordination. Thus, by preventing the priests intermarrying with the people where they resided, the results were produced as by the similar arrangement of Isis in her mysteries. The conquerors and the conquered were alike admissible, but all admitted forfeited their nationality and became members of the Roman Church, just as a Hebrew admitted to the Chaldee rites, or a Greek to the Egyptian, no longer remained a Hebrew or a Greek, but was bound by a higher oath and a more sacred obligation to the great brotherhood.

Such was the course adopted by St. Siricius. His successor was less hypocritical. It is stated by Zozimus,—it is believed by all respectable historians,—that he, for payment, as *Pontiff*, licensed the evocation of the evil one; nay more, he consented to license and employ the professed Chaldean sorcerers, whom the laws of the Pontiff *Emperors* had sentenced to death. This fact stands on record, proving that in the siege by Alaric, Celestine was not only Bishop of Rome, but had the Pontifical power of dispensing with and overruling the Imperial laws, a power as distinct from that of bishop as the jurisdiction exercised by the Duke of Wellington in licensing pilots at the Cinque Ports is from his powers as *Commander-in-Chief*, or his *quasi*-Episcopal authority as Constable of the Tower over its chaplains.

The victory of the apostasy, complete in Europe, had yet, however, to be consummated in Asia. The school of Antioch, according to Mr. Newman, was practically Protestant. The hardy mountaineers and converted Jews who formed it, contended that Scripture means exactly what it says. They were deep, critical students. They weighed every word, but remained obtusely insensible to Origen and

Digitized by Google

Basil, and Jerome's mystifications. Believing that no private Christian could habitually deceive, they shrunk from attributing deceit to the apostles. Disbelievers in the sacramental grace, ignorant of auricular confession, believing the resurrection of the material body, and not the creation of a gaseous substance wherewith to clothe it, these men were hard and stern logicians. They held the Fall to be a reality, the Godhead of Christ a reality, salvation by faith a reality, and were not willing these should be explained away. Arab by descent, they inherited the sharp, calculating qualities of their race; strict logicians, first-rate mathematicians, admirable linguists, they were wholly deficient in rhetoric and imaginative powers. Their tendency was to the strict, the practical, the definite.

Now in the Eastern Empire things had taken the opposite course. Gregory the Thaumaturgus, a distinguished member, it may be, a chief of the Isiac mysteries, suddenly proclaimed that the Queen of Heaven had appeared to him, and miraculously instructed him to go forth, preaching her worship. He did so with all manner of signs and lying wonders. He cured the nervous, he healed the sick, he read men's thoughts, he revealed the future, he performed all the miracles of a Cagliostro or a Dupotêt. His name was trembled at. The Pagans followed him, for he explained to them the creed but imperfectly disclosed in the lesser mysteries. The Christians admired, for he spoke to them of the Trinity with confidence and faith. The Alexandrian Church trembled. All the world was gone after him. One course was easy,—to make him a *Bishop*. He accepted the offer. He agreed to teach that the Son of God should be called in public worship Jesus Christ, instead of Horus, as before. The Church received him unbaptized, ignorant of, and without instruction in Scripture. He was received, baptized, confirmed, ordained, and consecrated in one day, and by his wonder-working powers the worship of the Virgin was everywhere set up. His example was followed. Basil and the two other Gregories aided him, and Gnosticism itself had now disappeared through the gradual departure of the Arian Goths for western conquest, and the worship of the Virgin alone remained.

The Imperial Guards seem, however, to have been recruited from the North, or in Britain. They were impatient at this new worship. It did not please them to fast 160 days in the year, the necessary condition for communion with the invisible world. They had no taste for self-flagellation nor hair shirts. The idea of cleanliness being sinful was not consonant to the

Digitized by Google

regulations which sent a man to drill for the slightest speck on his appointments; and it is at least possible that the young guardsmen, as they contrasted their bright silver helmets and glittering attire with the costume of the filthy and frouzy friars, who vaunted that they had never washed or changed their clothes for twenty years, felt very dissatisfied at finding every boudoir pre-occupied by these dirty demoniacs of the desert. Certain however it is, that between the Imperial Guards, officers or men, and the Carmelite friars, there was small sympathy.

The Emperor at length, seeing the danger of the superstition so widely diffused, appointed Nestorius head of the Antioch School to the patriarchate of Constantinople. It is not our business to argue in defence of Nestorius's personal piety. He may, if an unconverted man, still have been right in resistance to idolatry, as Horsley was right in resistance to Tomline.

Let us, however, simply imagine an intellectually enlightened, daring, strong-headed, somewhat passionate Arab gentleman, adhering almost servilely to the literal words of Scripture, placed at the head of a Church of which the priests were mere panderers to vice and superstition. He strives,—whether spiritually minded or not we pretend not to say,—to direct men's minds from the Virgin to her Son. He declared that she was not the procreatrix of God, that her Son derived only his human nature from her, and that she, although blessed above women, was but a woman still. In other words, he denied that God had become incarnate in the Virgin. He denied the Chaldean doctrine that the Virgin, and not her Son, broke the serpent's head.

A storm was preparing. The populace was excited, the bishops were moved, the clergy clamoured. The Emperor called a Council. It was at Ephesus, a place carefully arranged, as easy of access by the Egyptians and Italians, who came by sea,—difficult of access to the Arabians, who must travel by land. The Pontiff of Venus and High Priest of Rome presided. Nestorius refused to yield. The monks were violent,—the guards chastised them. The stones and filth showered on the troops were returned rudely with the lance-shaft, and the vine-branch. The Emperor's feelings were worked upon. Ought laymen to interfere? The Council was left to itself. The bludgeons of Basil and the cutting-knives of Cyril's followers prevailed over the arguments of the godly. Nestorius was excommunicated,—expelled,—murdered; all who adhered to him cast out, and

Digitized by Google

solemn curses were evoked on all who refused to worship the newly-created goddess. At the same time the festival of the Assumption of the Assyrian Goddess into heaven, hitherto celebrated in the mysteries, was now imposed upon the whole Church, and the goddess was thus represented to have risen from the dead, and to be the bride of God. Since that time it has been observed throughout the Apostasy, and none who decline worshipping the holy Goddess,—Mary, the genitress of God,—can hope to be saved.

Now here we must fix attention to the facts of the case. Whoever, in the words of St. Basil, in his Liturgy, refused to address their prayers to Divæ Sanctæ Mariæ genetricis Dei,* as the mediatrix between God and man, was declared no member of the established creed. Could Christians remain in communion with a Church that would impose such terms of communion? Were the Church of England to do this, would Mr. Elliott, or Mr. Birks, or Mr. Faber, subscribe to its articles any longer? Were the Free Church of Scotland to do this, would it not universally be rejected by all Christian communities? We ask a decisive answer. If every man who denied the godhead of the Virgin, and refused to regard her as the sole hope and fountain of salvation, was forced out of the Church;—if the scourge, the prison, and the rack, were the portion of all who protested for truth;—if the mountains of Wales, of the Alps, of America and of Kourdistan, alone afforded a refuge for the persecuted saints;—if those, scattered, divided, cut off, and broken as they were, preferred death to communion with the apostasy;—if they adhered to the same pure, unblemished, scriptural worship addressed to Christ alone of the early times;—if their descendants have sustained the never-ceasing persecutions both of Greece and Rome, and have preserved their existence only by their mountains and by God's blessing on their swords;—if the most benighted amongst them, after fourteen hundred years' seclusion, retained so much Gospel light that even American Congregationalists thought it a duty to commune at their table, whilst their bishops opened their pulpits to the American Congregationalists;—if even English Tractarians can specify nothing as held by them which the Church of England, as exemplified in Jewel and Hooker, and even Horsley and Van Mildert, does not hold too, what right have we to presume

* These words clearly symbolize incarnation of the male Deity in the Virgin, precisely similar to that believed in Egypt of Isis, and in Assyria of Semiramis, or Astarte, or Athor, the Harlot of Babylon.

Digitized by Google

them heretics, or to conclude those accursed from the faith who have suffered so nobly for the faith of Christ?

We rejoice that the British Church, Scotch, Welsh, or Irish,—Pict, Celt, or Caledonian,—had no representatives at the Council of Ephesus. The British probably never knew its decision. It is doubtful if they even inquired into its existence. They had thrown off all connexion both with the Court and the Church of Rome.

Can we say more? Could apostasy go further than when the worship of the Queen of Heaven was made the test of orthodoxy? We cannot doubt that the Council of Ephesus filled up and completed the utter apostasy of the Church; that it set up the Chaldean worship for that of Christ, just as the Israelites became apostate when Jezebel caused men to bow before Baal instead of Jehovah.

We could easily enlarge, but surely we have given enough evidence that the Church of Rome, itself apostatizing to the worship of Astarte by A.D. 382, had drawn the whole Oriental Church into the same apostasy before A.D. 436. We go farther, and declare, that except within the confined limits of the Papal States, given him as an appanage by Charlemagne, within which he is allowed to play at government, the claims and powers of the Pontiff have never altered, varied, or changed, since the acceptance of the Pontificate in A.D. 378; and that if Damasus and Siricius, who expelled Apollinaris from the Church, persecuted Vigilantius, and crushed Jovinian, were not Antichrists, then the comparatively contemptible little coward, Mastai Ferretti, is not an Antichrist now. Antichrist is he that denieth that Christ is to come in the flesh; and such was Damasus, and such every succeeding Pope. All of his successors, by their teaching the Divinity of his mother, impliedly deny that he was the very Man, but without sin.

Here, then, for a moment we leave this subject. It is for those who deny the utter apostasy of the Romish Church in the fourth century to show that she retained any one spark of spiritual light. It is idle to talk of the arch-impostor Jerome, and the foul deceiver Ambrose, as here and there showing some little knowledge of truth when they had to do with real Christians whom it was necessary to deceive by an appearance of sympathy. It is equally idle to specify the retired Augustine, who seems bowed down by authorities and deceived by forged miracles and fraud, to have trembled at his own want of belief, yet with a faltering hand to have clung to the Rock of Ages.

Digitized by Google

The question is not whether one such timid saint as Augustine, ordained before the apostasy, may have been allowed to continue in the fallen Church up to A.D. 410, having no fresh subscription to take, no pledge to offer; the question would be, whether there were any like him, and whether he himself would at a later date have been received. There was a Leighton even in the Scotch Episcopal Church of the seventeenth century, but we do not on that account believe Dalyell and Lauderdale and Sharpe to have been Christian men; nor have we any cause to believe that Augustine produced the slightest practical result *in his own time*, although his writings undoubtedly, under God, when brought under the consideration of the northern tribes by the art of printing, were honoured to lead them to the road of truth. In the South they never have been much thought of; on the contrary, the best have been prohibited. In the East they have never been known. Augustine did not attempt to stay the apostasy,—he only wept for it. The Romish Church cares little for the tears of its opponents,—it dreads more their prayers. Above all, it dreads men who *act* under prayerful influence.

Is, then, Rome the Babylon of the Apocalypse? If at Babel began that first great apostasy which substituted the worship of Shemir and her son Nimrod, the joint deliverers, for that of Messiah;—if that apostasy, after extending itself over all the olive races of men, was broken by the sword of Xerxes, its soldiers driven into Tibet, its priests to Pergamos;—if from Pergamos those priests removed with their Virgin Goddess to Rome;—if Rome then solemnly placed itself under the guardianship of this Virgin Goddess;—if a large part of the Roman aristocracy became secretly initiated into her worship, whilst the masses were left to the old Polytheism;—if this organization excited the alarm of the northern military conquerors, who sought to exterminate it equally with Christianity;—if in the fourth century the head of the Virgin worshippers succeeded, by means of what is now called freemasonry, in joining all Oriental worshippers and sects against the northern despotism;—if Origen and Ammonius and Clement availed themselves of this to delude professing Christians into initiation in the Chaldee mysteries, just as the comparatively harmless masons of the Continent were led without knowing it to the abyss of Illuminism by the renegade Jesuits of 1776;—if thus Christianity became insensibly blended with Virgin worship, of the mysteries;—if the persecution of Dioclesian, whilst destroying the godly,

Digitized by Google

left unscathed the worshippers of the female principle, who yielded to the blow;—if the success of the British Christians under Constantine over the Heathen Romans, whilst emancipating the oppressed Church, enabled the concealed Chaldeans to possess themselves of its benefices;—if the union of the two creeds was arranged by mutual combination of the dark races against the fair-haired Arians of the North;—if it were consummated by the election of the Bishop of Rome to be also the High Priest of Isis;—if the whole Chaldean dogmas, doctrine, dress, and discipline, were then adopted by the Church, and all who refused submission cast out;—and if the faith of Rome now differs nothing from what that of Babylon was in the days of Belshazzar, save that the *name*, and the name only, of the blessed Saviour has been substituted for that of Nimrod, or Baal, and that Shemir is called by her Sanscrit name, Maria. If Roman worship be, in short, but Chaldee translated into Latin, then indeed it follows that Rome may well be called Babylon, the Mother of Harlots, and Abominations of the Earth.

Is there any one hardy enough to question these points? Is there a reasonable doubt of any? If there be, we are not afraid to grapple with him. We have carefully avoided loading our remarks with authorities, because the number we had collected would, in the most abbreviated form, have doubled the text, and to give part only would have led some to infer that we were destitute of ample evidence for the rest. To some clerical errors, arising from haste, we plead guilty; but on re-perusing these articles, there is no fact stated which the present writer, on his conscience, sees reason to qualify or doubt. Should life and leisure and health be granted him, he may not improbably, at some future time, enlarge and complete the scheme of which the present is but a synopsis. Meanwhile, he desires to see how far what in all humility he has ventured to suggest may meet the sympathy of those far better versed in Oriental history, and far more deeply devoted to God's work than he can pretend.

One point, however, still remains. We have decided that Rome is Babylon,—have we not still to inquire whether the Pope is the last great Antichrist, and whether Rome and Romanism themselves are not to be swallowed up and destroyed before that last great Antichrist? Or, as suggested by the Duke of Manchester, will there not be *three* great foes to truth,—the Papacy, the Greek Emperor, and the False Messiah of the Jews and eastern world,—alike opposed to the Gospel in the latter time? In other words,

Digitized by Google

may we not have to contend against the ten-horned Beast, the false Prophet, and the Harlot of Babylon,—or will the Antichrist fully develop his character until the great Northern Emperor, and his ten vassal Kings, have utterly laid waste and destroyed Rome itself, as the centre of Red Republicanism and ruthless democracy? Then, indeed, we shall, the present writer believes, see the final judgment of Satan's machinations, and Papist, Puseyite, Greek, and Moslem, will all hail the false Messiah, who promises them deliverance from sorrow, but offers no salvation from sins. Then will that Antichrist appear related to the Papacy, as Nero to Agrippina, or Nimrod to Semiramis, the first of the apostasy, her child, her paramour, yet her destroyer, that he may reign alone. The ten kings eat her flesh and burn her with fire, whilst he establishes himself at Jerusalem, there to perish before the coming of the Lord. The writer does not believe in an Infidel Antichrist, but he does expect the coming of one who, aided by Satanic miracles, will pretend to be the Son of God; and he believes the Roman Pontificate to be that which letteth his coming, and will let, till it be taken out of the way, and the worship of the harlot of Babylon give place to the false Christ.

Art. II.—THE CHURCH COMPLETED, AND THE WORLD CONDEMNED.

In our day of evil, when the Church moves over the wilderness in the shadow of a cloud,—but there is sunshine upon the World,—it is needful to inquire, repeatedly and carefully, what is God's design regarding both? lest we fail to estimate as we ought, either the privilege of the one, or the peril of the other, as we are taught them in the Scriptures.

We pass our grieved eye hastily over the household of faith, and as we realize their fewness, their estrangement, and their obscurity, we wonder what the end will be,—whereas the men of this life fill their mouths with laughter, and are strong upon their foundation. It would seem as if these were on their way back to paradise; but of those, we ask, is not the oasis narrowing to a tuft?—will not the tuft soon become a single blade?—and, ere the Son of Man comes, shall there be one spot that is not desolately waste?

Carnal vision is sure to draw inferences such as these. But there is no room to fear. A single prediction of Jesus,

Digitized by Google

if we take fast hold of it, will enable us to understand with exceeding joy, alike what awaits the Church as its blessed portion, and the World as its oppressive doom. The prediction we refer to is in the seventeenth of John, and lies in the heart of these supplications: "*Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that their union may be made perfect; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Father, I will*—Volo, not Velim—*that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me before the foundation of the world.*"

On a single reading of these verses, we are convinced that the sum of them is a prayer for a visible union among believers, with a view to the conversion of the ungodly. And such has been the exclusive use that has been made of them of late. But this interpretation is both defective and erroneous. It is defective, inasmuch as it does not embrace the full detail of that assurance which is here given to the Church; and it is erroneous, inasmuch as it does not exhibit the true relation in which the Church stands to the world. There is Promise in the words, and that most overflowing. But there is also Denunciation, and Threatening, and Wrath. Rightly understood, our Saviour's prayer points us to *the Church Completed,* as his first desire; and then to *the World Condemned,* as his eventual design.

THE CHURCH COMPLETED.

The foundation of the Church was only about to be laid in the great sacrifice of the cross. Many a storm would it need to weather, and for many an age. At times it would seem buried amid the sands of the desert, and scarce a broken shaft might be discovered. The princes of earth will combine against it, and the gates of hell would open to engulf it.

All this is known to the Son of Man. But on a Completed Church, nevertheless, his eye at this moment rests, and for a Completed Church he intercedes.

Jesus realizes the Church Completed in regard to its *number;* for his words are, "Neither pray I for these alone,

Digitized by Google

but for them who shall believe on me through their word." Only a few stones have been as yet prepared for the Temple. No more than eleven were in the immediate view of the Saviour at this moment, as already built in. This, however, will not satisfy the soul of Jesus, and be a recompense for his travail. Others must be added. Others will be added. Jesus "prays," the apostles preach; and by the supplication of the one, and through "the word" of the other, a multitude shall believe, in every age and every country, and be joined to the living Church.

Since the hour when Jesus stood by the side of Kedron, on his way to Gethsemane, up to this present time, this prayer has been fulfilling; and it is not exhausted yet. He prays still, and prays for all who have been given Him. Neither has the truth which apostles announced lost its efficacy yet. They still preach, and preach over all the earth. The complement of the faithful is not yet made up. Christ's net is still in the waters; He still is gathering his own to land from day to day. And, even among the most hardened, there are some for whom He is lifting up his hands in heaven, and whom He will number with his chosen in the end.

It looks a tedious process; and when the multitude of the unconverted is put in contrast with the Church of the converted, we may feel unable to conceive that life shall yet cover all the earth. But there are means which cannot fail, and every one added to the Church will add others. Jesus sends forth the apostles. By the apostles many believe. These, faithful in their turn, spread the grace which has come to them. It spreads. It comes to us. We, too, believe; and, through us, others also. The life is perpetuated,—it is transmitted,—it is diffused. And one living soul quickens another. And still around and onward the life flows; until, as the answer of Emanuel's prayer, all who are ordained to eternal life believe, and the Church is perfected in its *fulness!*

In itself, the thought of the Church in its fulness is elevating. But it adds to the interest of the anticipation to remember, that, to this increase and complement, every believer shall be found in the end to have contributed. Even "to walk among the nations of the saved" will be full of blessedness. But what an element of concord and delight will it be,—what love and praise will it awaken, if, from the Great Apostle of the Gentiles, wearing the brightest crown of all, down to the lowest member of that glorious company

Digitized by Google

which covers the fields of heaven, there will not be so much as one who cannot rejoice in having saved a soul from death and polished a jewel that is set in the diadem of Jesus!

But Christ realizes the Church completed in regard to its *fellowship*, for, says He,—"I pray that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee." "I pray, also, that they may be one in us;" "I in them, and thou in me, that their union may be perfected."

There is union among all believers, even already. There is union with *Christ Himself*, for "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit." (1 Cor. vi. 17.) Yea, "We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." (Eph. v. 30.) And there is union with *one another*, for "We being many," it is written, Rom. xii. 5, "are one body in Christ." And again, Eph. ii. 14, we read, "He is our peace, who hath made both one."

Beyond this, however, there is a union which the Church has not enjoyed as yet,—which the earth has never witnessed; for what saith Paul, in Eph. iv. 12—16? "The perfecting of the saints, the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ;"—"that we may grow up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

This is union,—union resting upon truth, and which has no fellowship with error; union which embraces all, and leaves not one single believer out; union which will be gloriously realized on that day when we see Jesus and are made like Him.

But it is *this* union which Jesus contemplates, and intercedes for. He prays for the union of ALL believers—of all who *have* believed, and of all who *shall yet* believe. It is not merely a comprehensive—it is a Universal union on which the heart of Jesus is set. His soul embraces the Entire Nation of the Saved. And no union short of this meets the terms of his prayer.

Then—Jesus prays for a PERFECT union. He pleads that "the union of believers may be "perfected"—"perfected" as to its universal scope; but also "perfected" in regard to its nature, and development, and perpetuity—for he implores that it may be a union, even *such as subsists between the*

Digitized by Google

Father and Son—between the Father as God, and the Son as the Man Christ Jesus. It was union of this character, and depth, and intensity, that Jesus had resolved upon,—and what union could be more "perfect?" It is *intimate, consubstantial, identifying.* The Father does not merely stand in a near relation to the Son. He dwells in Him! Again—it was *living, actuating, energetic* union. The Father dwelt in the Son. And from the Father the Son received the Spirit without measure, to create Him when unborn—to anoint Him for his ministry—to quicken him from among the dead! Further—it was *affectionate, endearing, blissful* union. The Father loved the Son, and delighted in Him. And it was on the Father's bosom of kindness and sympathy that the Son found all his rest. Lastly—it was *abiding, uninterrupted, eternal* union. A union which never was suspended, and could never be terminated. A union which had its foundations in the essential Nature of God, and which, as it never knew a beginning, never would be marred by change.

It is *this* union of which the union among all believers is to be the antitype. The united Church shall be united, even as the Father and the Son are united. And a less perfect union than this, Christ would not be satisfied with.

Whilst, therefore, we ought to long for union—as the predicted condition of believers, it is utterly vain for us to think that it lies within our means to accomplish the unity of the Church. The idea has come from God, and God only is fit to execute the plan. God has announced the grand event, and in his own time, and with his own right hand of zeal will he omnipotently bring it to pass.

But as entering into his idea of "perfect" union, Jesus finally prays for union WITH THE GODHEAD, as well as union with one another, after the similitude of the Godhead. "May they be one in US!" God is the source of union; it flows from Him. God is the basis of union; it rests on Him. But he must also be the scene and dwelling-place where it is ultimately and for ever "perfected." The Church has yet to be presented unto the Father. The Church has yet to be welcomed to its mansions by the Father. The Church has yet to be united under Christ unto God. The Church has yet to be embosomed in God! And *this* is what Jesus asks, when he asks, "that all may be *one in us.*" But what he asks will be granted. As "One Body," shall reconciled and reconciler together—believers of every age, and from every land, with Jesus as "the first-born of the many brethren," enter "the palace of the King," and rejoice

Digitized by Google

for ever in his love. The Son shall lie in the Father's bosom, and all the faithful shall lie in the arms of the Son; and thus shall it be realized that "all are one in God."

The Fellowship of the Saints, then, is no vague, nor uncertain hope; but in this respect, as in all others, shall the Church be Completed, when God's time arrives, to the lasting joy of those who have kept the faith. As yet the ransomed know not each other; here they are insulated, and scattered over the wastes of earth. Still are they *truly* one —and, in the end, they shall be *actually* one. Their root is in God himself: and in heaven shall all be seen growing on the same vine—offering their fruit to the same husbandman —sharing the same perpetual sunshine—and sending the same holy fragrance to the ends of the universe!

As the consummation of his desires, we remark, finally, that Jesus realizes the Church Completed with regard to its GLORY; for he adds—"and the glory which thou hast given me, I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are." Grotius can find no more in "the glory" here spoken of, than the power of working miracles; and Olshausen determines it to mean "that glorification of the inner life, which is manifested here below." Bengel, on the other hand, holds, that "all the glory of the Only Begotten is imparted unto the faithful;" and Calvin affirms, that "as the image of the Father's glory was imprinted on the human nature of Christ, so we, if in Christ, are transformed into the same." But Titmann is more correct than most other expositors; for, in the term "glory," he includes all the honours which belong to Christ as Head of the Church, and with which he was crowned, "for the suffering of death."

Christ has "a glory" which was not given Him—even his essential glory, which belonged everlastingly to Him with the Father. But it is of that "glory," which was "*given*" Him that He makes mention here; and it is this which shall be the reward of his obedience in the flesh. What it is, we cannot tell. Eye has not seen it, ear has not heard it, it has not entered into the heart of man to conceive it. Yet this we know, that it is something which will make the Son conspicuous above all other beings, and direct upon Him for ever the adoring gaze of a redeemed creation. But *this* is what Jesus means by "the glory which has been given to Him;" and it implies majesty and grandeur—magnificence and power—dignity and honour, above all that has yet been seen. It is effulgence, such as broke from amid the clouds over the plains of Bethlehem—it is splendour, such as was

Digitized by Google

manifested on the hill of Transfiguration—it is radiance like that which smote Paul to the dust, as he went to Damascus.

The same glory, however, that envelops Jesus, are the righteous to be invested with. They are to rise upon the firmament of the universe as stars, and shine without dimness, or night. They are to become as brightly manifest among the works of God, as their exalted Head. And not till then, is their union "perfected;" not till then, are they united in the union of the Godhead; not till then are they "one, even as the Father and the Son are one." It is not enough that the Son of God took off the robe of righteousness from his own shoulders, to cast it over the nakedness and shame of his bride. He must take off the robe of his "glory;" and, like Jonathan, clothe David, to whom his heart cleaves, with his royal garments. Pardon! how sweet a gift. Holiness! how blessed a privilege. Eternal life! how exalted a condition. But this exhausts not the love of Jonathan. "His love is wonderful." And the redeemed must wear, in addition to all beside, a diadem of "glory;" they must be one with Jesus in his "glory," as well as in his blessedness; the Church must be "perfected" in her union, by shining forth in "the glory" of her King! David must sit at Saul's table in Jonathan's apparel! And not, till then, are the faithful united in that unity, of which the pattern is in the Godhead itself and alone.

We have seen now what is Christ's idea of a completed Church; and it is a Church perfected in its number—its fellowship—its glory. But if this be the consummation to which Scripture points—nothing less secure, less blissful, less ample—then it must be plain, that the unity of the Church is the cause of God, and not the achievement of man—the glory of millennial ages, not the wonder of the present time.

To love one another on the ground of a common propitiation and a common pilgrimage, is a high duty; and it ought to be, more than it is, our effort and distinction. Unity, however,—the unity of the redeemed Church in the Godhead, and like the Godhead, is an enterprize which belongs to Christ himself, and is reserved to his coming.

Nor have we any cause to mourn that it is so appointed; but only reason for congratulation. Unity will be a blessed and a hallowing thing among saints, when all are saints. But unity on earth, whilst still tares and wheat are growing together, has ever resulted in tyranny, and will continue to do so until the union of millennial rest overtake us.

Digitized by Google

Indeed, nothing could more truly eclipse the glory of God than for men to be able to say, as now they boastingly hope they soon may proclaim, "We hushed all storms, and renewed the dominion of peace. We knit the Church into unity, and perfected her strength." These issues are the prerogatives of God; and for man to aim at them, with his own resources, will not only prove abortive, but be disgraced as sinful. It is the plain of Shinar, with its vain imagination, if not its rebellious daring, under another form.

By shrewd organization, and mutual forbearance, and loving concession, and elevated spirituality, and familiar intercourse of believer with believer, mild philanthropists expect to usher in the era of Christian union, before a few years are past. "I create peace," however, is the attribute not of the creature, but of the Creator, and what Almightiness can alone accomplish, it is delusive in man to aim at.

THE WORLD CONDEMNED.

We have stated it as an opinion that the unity of the Church is a millennial event, and that whilst the Spirit excites our longings after it, Christ alone shall have the glory of its realization. But it will be asked, as a fatal objection to such a view, Is not the world to believe, and be regenerated through the means and by the spectacle of a united Church? And no doubt the terms our Lord makes use of when he speaks of "the world believing," seem, at first sight, to point in this direction, as most commentators, both ancient and modern, take for granted.

Chrysostom, for instance, gives the import of Christ's words, "that the world may believe," in the following gloss:—"There is no scandal so great as division,—whereas unity amongst believers is a great argument for believing." Tholuck also adopts the same interpretation, and remarks, in proof, "That in all ages brotherly love has been to the world a stone of stumbling, or an attractive magnet, as is illustrated by the history of the Waldenses and Moravians." And Olshausen, re-echoing these sentiments, observes: "The unity of believers in love is intended to be a witness to the world for the Divine mission of Christ; and the experience of the apostolic Church has shown how the glow of love which is entertained by believers for each other has afforded proof to the Heathen that there must be something superior in the bosom of the despised new sect."

Augustine, on the other hand, questions the principle on which these hopes are raised, and shrewdly asks, "Will the

Digitized by Google

world believe when we shall be all one in the Father and the Son? Is not this unity that peace eternal, which is the reward of faith, rather than faith itself? For though in this life all of us who hold in the same common faith are one, yet even this unity is not a means of belief, but the consequence of it. What means, then, that 'all may be one, that the world may believe?' Christ prays for the world, when He says, 'Neither pray I for these alone, but for all those who shall believe on me through their word.' Whereby it appears that He does not make unity the cause of the world believing, but prays that the world may believe. And the meaning would be clearer if we always put in the word 'ask.' 'I ask' that all may be one. 'I ask' that the world may believe."

By "the world" it is clear the Bishop of Hippo understood "the elect;" and the prayer of Christ in their behalf he would represent as bearing on their ultimate deliverance. Calvin, however, with greater accuracy, regards "the world," who are to believe, as "the reprobate," for beyond all doubt this is the signification which must be attached to the term in its present connexion. Throughout the whole seventeenth chapter of John, "the world," Calvin remarks, is taken for the rejected, and not for the promiscuous inhabitants of our earth. The very nature of the clause,—"They one in us, that the world may believe,"—moreover, indicates that "world" means some others distinct from those for whose union with the Father Christ supplicates. But more clearly still, at the ninth verse, our Lord intimates that it is "the ungiven,"—the impenitent, the lost,—whom he separates from his own perfected ones.

Shall the lost, then, in the end "*believe?*" Of this the terms of our Saviour's intercession leave no doubt. "The world," even the reprobate, shall "believe." But to ascertain the sense in which this will be fulfilled, we must bear in mind what is said of lost angels in James ii. 19, and what is foretold of lost men too in Philippians ii. 10, 11. Even devils "believe," we learn from James; but with what result? "Devils believe,"—"believe" in something more than the unity of the Church, in the unity of God, "but tremble." And of the reprobate, as well as of the righteous, Paul declares, "That at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, whether in heaven, or on earth, or in hell, and that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father!"

So soon as they read "that the Church is to be one, that

Digitized by Google

the world may believe," men rush to the conclusion that the Completed Church is to convert the world. "The world"—that is, say they, the impenitent—are to "believe," that is, are to be converted. "We are one, that the world may believe," that is, the impenitent are to be converted, through the visible oneness of the Church. And so the position is reached, that the manifested unity of believers is the grand means for the regeneration of the world.

But exegesis of this sort must land us directly in the falsehood of universal restoration; for if the Completed Church is one day to bring all men to the faith, then, as (according to what has been already shown) it is in eternity the Church is completed, the salvation of the wicked, even of the lost, will be in progress subsequent to the judgment-day, and the end of all things.

The truth, however, is, that when Jesus connects "the belief of the world" with the "perfection of the Church," He has reference, not to the advantage, but to the condemnation of the wicked, and speaks to warn, not to encourage. The Completed Church is destined to affect materially the character of the reprobate, the condition of the lost, but only in disastrous aggravation of their ruin; and the unity which is to believers the final measure of their exaltation, will be the date of consuming remorse and desperate rebellion to all who are "without."

For, in the first place, the Church Completed, with Jesus in glory at its head, will convince the lost that "Jesus came from God." "I in them, and thou in me; that, their union being perfected, the lost may know that thou didst send me." Then, in the second place, the Church Completed, and shining in the glory of Jesus, will convince the lost that they rejected love which was even infinite. "I in them, and thou in me, that their union being perfected, the lost may know that thou hast loved them, as thou lovedst me."

In the end, therefore, "the world" will be confronted by the Church; the lost shall see the ransomed; and the unbelieving shall "believe" at length. But they shall "believe" only as the rich man did, when he lifted up his eyes and saw Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. Their "belief" will not be, what many fondly dream, the termination of all their waywardness and their reception into bliss, but it shall be the response of an awakened conscience, and the prelude of everlasting remorse.

One would be disposed to think that they who found one of their central objections to Pre-millennianism on the ground

Digitized by Google

that it creates a new species of agency for the renovation of mankind, must see that, in laying the stress which they do upon the unity of the Church, and connecting therewith all vital change upon the earth, they are contravening their own principles and exposing themselves, more than we, to the charge of superseding the work of the Holy Ghost. In fact, the unity of the Church occupies the same place, in the system of our opponents, as the Person of Christ in our scheme; and, as analogous centres of influence, what is true of the one must hold good of the other.

The truth, however, is, that we have no need to remind our friends upon the other side of the Pre-millennial question of this flaw in their argument,—this inconsistency in their position, for they have no basis whatsoever for the idea to which they so warmly cling. "Nempe cum eandem doctrinam" (scribit Nœseltus Opusc., v. ii.) "omnes Christiani tuerentur, non modo conjunctis viribus eandem propagabant ad alios, sed etiam *ipsa virtus*, efformata ad illam Christi disciplinam, commendebat doctrinam disciplinamque ipsam; qua re efficiebatur ut vel Profani agnoscerent ejus præstantiam, et divinam Jesu Christi a Deo missi auctoritatem." But thus to anticipate the Church converting the world by its visible unity, is to delude ourselves with a carnal speculation, and the hope will not be realized. "The world" is beset with means, and encompassed with grace. "They have Moses and the prophets." They have Scripture and Providence. They have the cross! And if not converted, in a day of love, under a dispensation of the Spirit, by an instrumentality such as now exists, they would not be converted, even though they stood with Balaam on the top of Peor and saw the perfected Church, "as the valleys spread forth, as gardens by the river's side, as the trees of lign-aloes, which the Lord hath planted; and as cedar-trees beside the waters!"

At all events, that which Nœselt, and Tholuck, and Chrysostom, imagine as so desirable and sure,—a world converted by the visible unity of the Church,—is not the subject of prophecy in any part of Holy Writ. On the contrary, it is plainly revealed, that when the Church has put on her girdle of union,—her crown of glory, she is in the beatific presence of her God; her fulness is complete; her days of waxing and waning are over; and all who are not numbered with her saints shall remain beyond "the great gulf" for ever.

Our position, accordingly, is the reverse of that which finds so much favour in these days, and which has so much

Digitized by Google

critical authority on its side; for, instead of imagining that the enemies of Christ are to be reclaimed by the augmented love and closer fellowship of his followers, we feel assured, on the testimony of Scripture, that the completion of the Church will be the condemnation of the world.

These sentiments are not likely to commend themselves to many beyond the readers of our Journal, and even with some of these there may be no great disposition to entertain them. Union is the necessity of our times, the strength of the Church, the demand of Christ, and the salvation of the world,—we hear it powerfully argued over all Christendom. But, ere they set out upon this course of agitation, men should see that they thoroughly understand what union is, lest they sow darnel for wheat, and gather what Ovid styles "Concordia discors," as their only increase. Union is a common phrase and a venerable aim. The desire of it has long been in the world, and at stated intervals it has become a watchword; but when it is sifted it turns out to be inferior and spurious; not union, but combination,—the nugatory result of policy and compromise. And this will not answer. Our conceptions of unity must be derived carefully from the Scriptures. God alone knows what unity is, and He tells us of no other than that of which the Trinity is the exemplar!

That Christian should love Christian, and that the whole household of faith should dwell together in bonds of gracious intimacy, is a certain duty which believers ought more diligently to fulfil than they do; and their regard to which would exert an overawing and repressive influence upon the world. Yet it is a pure fallacy to imagine that a united Church would renew the ungodly and cover the earth with righteousness; for, on the contrary, as, in virtue of its union, in just the intenser concentration of holiness, the united Church would only call forth more antipathy and abhorrence. So long as it is only love it glows with, and presents to notice, a united Church will even be admired, as was the case during the early ages of Christianity. But let the effulgence of holiness outshine the splendour of love, and the irregenerate will set no bounds to their hatred of it. Union, as the result of love, "the world" can easily tolerate. Union, as the perfection of holiness, "the world" can only recoil from.

Perhaps the chief reason why the hearts of so many have of late been set upon an immediate union among believers is, the use the Papacy makes of those differences which exist in the Churches of the Reformation. Because the Romanist twits us with our lack of unity, and boasts of his own, we are

Digitized by Google

tempted to build a tower like his and wrest from him his superiority. But the simple fact of the Papacy holding out itself as the architect and asylum of unity, should excite our suspicions rather than provoke to emulation. For is it not too likely that, as in all other things, so in her pretensions to unity, the great deceiver at Rome is only acting out her character as the rival of Christ,—yet, by her very challenge to all the earth, as the centre round which the nations must revolve, proving that this is the sole prerogative of Him whose mitre she has filched, and whose triumphs she so impiously mimics?

Art. III.—GENESIS.

Chapter III.

Ver. 8.—"And they heard the voice of the Lord God (Jehovah-Elohim) walking (or, who was walking) in the garden in the cool (*Heb.*, the wind) of the day; and Adam (*Heb.*, the man) and his wife hid themselves from the presence (*Heb.*, the face) of the Lord God amongst (*Heb.*, in the midst) the trees of the garden."

Scarce had the transgressors twisted their girdles, and thus completed the hasty covering which was to hide their shame from each other's eyes, when they heard the voice of the Lord God, and trembled as they were thus reminded that there was another eye to hide from. It was not, indeed, a long-known, but still it was a well-known voice. They had heard it before, and they recognised it at once. "It is the voice of Jehovah! He is coming,—whither shall we flee?" It was no mere sound; no casual blast or rush of the meeting streams; it was a living voice,—the voice of a being as true and personal as themselves. To them God was a real being, —a person; and his voice a real voice.*

* "We conclude that the *Logos* did not only appear in a visible manner, but conversed also with Adam and Eve audibly and by an articulate voice."—*Fleming's* "Christology," vol. ii., p. 249. The word "Voice" is used in several senses in Scripture. Sometimes it denotes a distinct articulate sound (Deut. iv. 12, 36; v. 22; Ezek. i. 24, 25, 28; x. 5); sometimes a commandment (the thing proclaimed by the voice) —(Ps. xcv. 7); sometimes thunder (the sound accompanying the voice) —(Exod. ix. 23, 28, 29; Job xxxvii. 5.) It was this voice that spoke to Cain (Gen. iv. 9), to Noah (Gen. vi. 13), to Abraham (Gen. xv. 1). It is said (Exod. xix. 19) that "Moses spake, and the Lord answered him by a *voice*." It was God's voice that shook Sinai and its wilderness; that

Digitized by Google

Whether any *form* were seen we know not. There might be, for God did always, in after-ages, as to Abraham, reveal Himself in a form. But this matters not. A distinct and intelligible voice addressed them; and they recognised it as the voice of Jehovah Elohim,—"the Lord God." They "heard" it, and they knew it. They had "heard" it before, and they are now to hear it again, though in circumstances far different.

When the Lord God thus uttered his voice He was "walking in the garden," for it seems not to be the *voice* that was moving or walking (as some think), but Jehovah Himself. Elsewhere He is spoken of in the same way. When speaking to Israel of Canaan, as their promised dwelling, He not only says, "I will set my tabernacle among you," but "I will *walk* among you." (Lev. xxvi. 12.) Or, when referring to their desert-sojourn, He gives, as a motive to entire purity in their habits, "The Lord thy God *walketh* in the midst of thy camp, therefore shall thy camp be holy." (Deut. xxiii. 14.) As the reference here is obviously to God's presence, as manifested in the Shekinah, or visible glory, so it might have been in Eden by some such visible form that the Lord revealed Himself and "walked" in Paradise.

It was "in the wind of the day" that Jehovah was heard. Meaning thereby, either at the time that the breeze was blowing, or *in* the breeze; or, more probably, *both*. It is generally in connexion with the wind, or whirlwind, that Jehovah is said to appear. (Ezek. i. 4.) In 2 Sam. xxii. 11, we read, "He was seen upon the wings of the *wind;*" in Ps. xviii. 10, we read, "He did fly upon the wings of the *wind;*" in Ps. civ. 3, we read, "Who walketh upon the wings of the *wind.*" In these passages we note the difference of expression, yet the identity of the general idea,—He was *seen* upon the wind; He did *fly* upon the wind; He did *walk* upon the wind; which last is the very expression in the passage before us.*

shook the posts of the temple (Isa. vi. 4). It is by this voice that "the Assyrian is to be beaten down." (Isa. xxx. 31.) It was this voice that Isaiah heard (vi. 4), and Ezekiel (i. 24; x. 5, 9), and Daniel (x. 6). It was this same voice that was heard at the baptism of Christ (Matt. iii. 17), at his transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 5). It is interesting to trace this "voice" throughout Scripture, so generally in connexion with the "cloud," or "glory." (2 Pet. i. 17.) It is sometimes terrific as the thunder; sometimes a "still small voice;" sometimes as the noise of a "multitude;" sometimes like many waters; by all these figures setting forth "the majestic, melodious, mighty voice of God."

* Yet, as in our passage it is ל and in others על, and as the former is

Digitized by Google

As soon as Jehovah appeared and his voice was heard, the transgressors fled. Terror took hold of them, and shame covered them.* Fig-leaves might hide them from each other's eyes, but when God comes nigh they must try something more effectual. They *flee*. That is their first effort. Their object is to get as far from Him as possible. But they need something else. They flee to the thickets, that there the gloom may render them invisible.

It was from the "presence," or "face," of God that they fled.† It is evident that something was seen by them, here and elsewhere called by this name. It was from this "face" of God that they turned away, just as the wicked are said hereafter to be "punished with everlasting destruction *from the presence* of the Lord." ‡ This name seems to be given

the usual expression for *at*, or *at the time of*, we must take "at the breeze of the day" as the primary sense. (See Gen. xlix. 27; Josh. x. 27, &c.) The Vulgate gives it, "ad auram post meridiem;" the Sept., *τὸ δειλινὸν*, i.e., the evening. Symmachus renders it, *διὰ πνεύματος ἡμέρας*; Theodotian, *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι πρὸς καταψύξιν τῆς ἡμέρας*. Jerome paraphrases it "declinante sole." ("Works," vol. v., p. 269.) Calvin thinks that, after their sin, they slept all night, and that it was in the *morning* that the voice awoke them. So, also, Diodati. (See *Morrison's* "Introductory Key to the Scriptures" on this passage.) The following passage from a writer formerly quoted may interest the reader:—"It is evident, from Scripture, that Jehovah the Son, the only visible God, appeared to Adam so soon as he was created, and on many after occasions. Adam heard his voice, and held familiar conversation with Him, as a man does with his friend. Then and ever afterwards, in all the ages previous to his incarnation, Jehovah seems to have made the sound or rushing of wind the visible symbol of his appearance. Thus He announced his approach to Job (xxxviii. 1). So He appeared to Ezekiel (i. 4). This also was the sign by which David knew that Jehovah was gone out before him to smite the host of the Philistines. (1 Chron. xiv. 15.) And, as this had always been the sign of the Divine approach, the coming of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles was announced in the sound of a rushing mighty wind. (Acts ii. 2.) Hence God is said to walk on the "wings of the wind." Now, as this was the usual token whereby Adam knew the approach of his Maker, so soon as he heard the sound of wind issuing from a cloud, walking among the trees of Eden, he was apprised of the approach of the offended Jehovah; and, alarmed by his fears, he ran to hide himself from the Divine presence among the thickets of the garden." —*Pirie's Works*, vol. iii., p. 68.

* Our readers will perhaps remember Spencer's line—

"All wrongs have mends, but no amendes of *shame*."

—(*Fairy Queen*, b. ii., cant. 1.)

Most true! No "amends of shame," but through Him who took our shame upon Himself.

† "Neque tamen dubito quin notabile aliquod præsentiæ Dei symbolum in flatu illo extiterit."—*Calvin*.

‡ *ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου*. This, of course, refers to the presence of Christ. But it was to this "presence" that all former "presences"

because the manifestation (whatever it might be) was that which, in God, corresponded to the face of man,—the part which reveals most of the man himself. It was a visible glory indicative of a personal presence,—the presence of the second person of the Godhead, who, from eternity, was the brightness of Jehovah's glory and the express image of his person. This visible glory (like the Shekinah in the wilderness pursuing the rebels) seems to have advanced towards them; and as *it* advanced *they* retreated,—the voice and the glory from which the voice issued combining to terrify them, for they were the voice and the glory of that God whom they

pointed. All these were but prefigurations of his glory,—the bright raiment which was to invest the Person of the God-man in the fulness of time. It is to this "presence," or "glory," or "Shekinah," that reference is made in such passages as the following: Gen. iv. 14, 16; xviii. 22; xix. 13; Exod. xxvii. 21; xxviii. 12, 30; Lev. i. 3, 5, 11. It is to the second Person of the Godhead that "presence," or "face," refers. He is essentially and eternally the "off-shining," or radiance of Jehovah's glory (*ἀπαυγασμα τῆς δόξης*), and the express image of his person (*χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἀυτõυ*, the impression or stamp of his person). He is also the "Word," as being the utterance or expression of the mind of Godhead,—the communication between the invisible and the visible. Thus, Owen calls Him "the essential image of the Father," and says, "were He not the *essential image* of the Father in his own Divine Person, He could not be the *representative image* of God to us, as He is incarnate." (On the Person of Christ.) Thus the voice that spoke in Eden was the voice of the WORD; and the presence that was seen was the presence of Him who is the radiance of Jehovah's glory. "The Logos," says Fleming, "according to the agreement of the sacred Trinity, was He that acted even to created intelligent beings as their immediate Head, in the name of God, essentially considered. The Logos, being infinite in regard of essence, could never be seen or known, even by the most glorious created spirits, had He not condescended to assume some created form,—such as that which the Jews called the Shekinah, or the glory of God; and it seems plain to me, that the Logos appeared thus in heaven to the angels. And I look upon it to be more than probable, that this assumed image was not barely light, or something like a luminous cloud, but was something likewise of a determined shape, appearing as an animated being. And I believe, from what I can judge by laying things together, that it was the exact representation of a man clothed with a most glorious garment of wonderful light. And I make no question but this ancient image was the very same with that wherein Christ appears now in glory, excepting that He has now a real animated body of human flesh, whereas before He had an ethereal one only, or one of some such sort of composition. But, excepting this, I make no question but that the features and lineaments of the one body and the other were as exactly, and more exactly, the same, than ever any picture was like an original. And when Christ was transfigured, I believe He appeared the very same to Moses that He appeared to be to him formerly, when he and the elders of Israel, as well as the angels then present, saw Him upon Mount Sinai (Exod. xxiv. 1, &c.)."—*Christology*, vol. ii., p. 255.

Digitized by Google

had disobeyed. Their own refuge is the trees of the garden; yet what shelter could they be from a glory so light, or from a voice which makes the mountains to shake? (Ps. xxix.)

That voice! It pierces the sinner's ear in a moment. It forces its way into the conscience. Nothing can withstand it. It is specially to the *conscience* that it speaks alarming, convincing, overpowering. When it speaks in the *law*, then the commandment comes (Rom. vii. 9); the sinner is smitten, he flees before it or falls under it. It weeps through him and lays him in the dust. His mouth is stopped; he is compelled to plead guilty. "By the law is the knowledge of sin."

And then, that glory! * It terrifies the transgressor. He cannot bear it, even afar off. Its approach overwhelms him. Even the saints have trembled at it,—Job (xlii. 5), Isaiah (vi. 5), and Daniel (x. 7, 8),—how much more the sinner! The "presence" of Jehovah is *light*, and that he cannot bear, for he loves the darkness. Israel got a glimpse of it on Sinai and trembled; the ungodly shall see it in the day of wrath and flee to the rocks for shelter.

And then see the insufficiency of human coverings. Till God came nigh the fig-leaves seemed safe enough; but He shows himself, and then the covering is found "narrower than a man can wrap himself in it." (Isa. xxviii. 20.) He flees, and tries another covering (for *leaves* will not do; he must have the whole *trees*), still "making lies his refuge, and under falsehood hiding himself." (Is. xxviii. 15.) For whither can he flee from God's "presence?" (Ps. cxxxix. 7.) Neither fig-leaves nor thickets will do. It is God that is the sinner's terror; and the nearer that He comes the greater is that terror.† No human coverings can avail. Darkness will not do. Distance will not do. The wrappings of man's merits will not do. To be *naked* before God is what he shrinks from; and none of these can hide his nakedness. That which alone can remove his terror and his shame is a shelter that is divine,—a covering that is infinite,—the righteousness of the Son of God.

In the day of wrath this scene of Eden will be repeated,—

* "Insigne divinæ præsentiæ symbolum."—*Calvin.*

† Jerome, in commenting on the first verse of the 82d Psalm,—"God standeth," or, as he has it, "Deus stetit,"—has a curious passage, in which he attempts to show the difference of the expressions, "God stands," "God walks," "God sits;" referring the first to his posture in reference to man innocent; the second to God's posture in reference to man guilty, as if He were moved out of his place to come to him; and the third in reference to God's posture to men before the judgment-seat.

Digitized by Google

man fleeing from the presence of God. In the absence of thickets he will betake himself to the rocks and hills. (Hos. x. 8; Rev. vi. 15, 16.) But what will these do? Can his eye not pierce these? Can his hand not pluck them thence? For thus the Lord has spoken, "Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down; and though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out thence." (Amos ix, 2, 3.)

Ver. 9.—"And the Lord God (*Heb.*, Jehovah-Elohim) called unto Adam (*Heb.*, the man) and said unto him, Where art thou?"

The voice which had been heard was no inarticulate noise such as tempest or thunder. It spoke explicitly and articulately. It addressed itself to Adam,—to "the man." The words are not "He *said* to," but "He *called* to" Adam. And there could be no mistake as to who was meant. He proceeds by making inquiry after him, that, step by step, He may make sin unveil itself, and draw confession from the sinner. He does not at once lay hold of the offender and extort a confession by terror. Neither does He proceed upon his own omniscience and say, "Thou art the man." His object is so to speak to the conscience that the man may confess, and be led without compulsion to survey his own devious steps. "Where art thou?" was the question. Simple, yet like the Lord's words to the woman of Sychar (John iv.), effectual for bringing all to light. As if He would say, "I expected to find thee at the appointed meeting-place, but I find thee not. How is it so? What has led thee away? Where art thou?" Thus he goes in quest of the sinner.†

Ver. 10.—"And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself."

The man replies immediately. God has met him face to face, and he cannot evade Him or decline an answer. He had heard the voice. He had known it at once. It was "in the garden" that he heard it, and terror took hold of him. He admits that he had fled from God, and that he was not where he ought to have been found. He excuses himself for fleeing because, being naked, he was afraid of the majesty of God; and feeling that he was unfit to stand

* "Graciously calling him to return, who would otherwise have eternally fled from God."—*J. Wesley's* "Sermons," vol. ii., p. 25.

Digitized by Google

before Him he had hid himself.* In so speaking, he seems to take credit to himself for having fled, and rather suggests that the blame lay with God, who had made him naked.† In this there is no confession of sin; there is fear and shame; but that is all. Instead of "declaring his transgression," he first attempts to hide it by hiding himself; and when that is vain, he shifts the blame from himself to God. It seems to be to this that Job refers, when he says, "If I covered my transgression as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom." (Job xxxi. 33.) Covering sin in any such way avails not. There is but one covering which is effectual,—the covering of the *blood*. It is by blood alone that sin can be "covered." Man, however, knew not this. He thought he could cover it himself. He had yet to learn that the only thing that can *cover* sin is that which can *absorb* it and make it to be as though it had never been. God had yet to unfold his own method and to teach man the efficacy of the blood as a covering; so that when he came to understand this he would feel that, in order to cover sin, it is not necessary to flee from God or to resort to thickets, but that receiving God's testimony to the covering efficacy of the blood he may meet God face to face without shame or fear, reversing the words of his first father, and saying, "I heard thy voice, and was not afraid, for I had found a covering; and, instead of hiding myself, I returned to thee."

Ver. 11.—"And he said, Who told thee (or declared to thee) that thou wast (or art) naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?"

God pursues the inquiry. His object is to make man convict himself. He has touched the conscience already, and He now sends the arrow deeper. Thou speakest of being "naked." How is this? Thou didst not feel thus at first. Hitherto thy nakedness has been no barrier between

* *Fleming* supposes that man, before he sinned, had a sort of "luminous vestment," which disappeared the moment he sinned ("Christology," b. iii., ch. 3); and adds, "Adam turning apostate, it was no way fit that he should wear the livery of the Shekinah any longer, and therefore the luminous garment with which he and Eve were clothed is taken away, and they are left naked." *Mede* has a somewhat similar idea, when he speaks of their "nakedness" as being an "obscuration of that glorious and celestial beauty which he had before his sin; the difference whereof was so great that he could not endure afterwards to behold himself any more, but sought for a covering, even to hide himself from himself."—"Works," (folio), p. 233.

† "Certe intolerabilis erat in Deum blasphemia quod mali originem in natura quærebat."—*Calvin.*

Digitized by Google

thee and me. Who, or what, has suggested the thought that it is so? Who, or what, has made thee afraid or ashamed to come? Whence hast thou got this knowledge, by means of which thou excusest thyself from drawing near to me, and palliatest thy guilt in fleeing from me? Man is silent. He answers not a word. No one has told him. The thought has started up from within. A strange, but irresistible, feeling has taken possession of him,—"I am naked; I cannot look upon God; God cannot look upon me." Without noticing man's silence, God proceeds with his inquiry. "Hast thou eaten of the tree which I prohibited?" This is the only thing that could have done it. Is it possible that thou hast already transgressed? Thus, by question after question, he leads man to the acknowledgment of his sin, making him feel that his sin is already known, that the true cause of his fear is no secret, and that "all things are naked and open unto the eyes of Him with whom he has to do."

Ver. 12.—"And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat."

He feels that God has had his eye upon him, and that what He says is true. It is the tree that has given him this knowledge of "evil." Had he waited God's time, the eating of it would have given him the knowledge of only good; but he has refused to wait; he has disobeyed God; he has made haste to be wise; and it has opened his eyes only to the *evil.* Still, however, he will take no blame to himself for doing what he has done. He makes no direct and honest answer to God, in freely confessing that he had eaten, yet he cannot deny the deed, and therefore, in the very act of admitting (not confessing), he casts the blame upon the woman,—nay, upon God, for giving him such a tempter.* Here let us mark such truths as these.

1. The difference between *admitting* sin and *confessing* it. Adam admits it,—slowly and sullenly,—but he does not confess it. He is confronted with a Being in whose presence it would be vain to deny what he had done; but he will go no farther than he can help. He will tacitly concede, when

* Jerome has an ingenious comment on Lam. iii. 65. "Give them sorrow of heart," is our translation, the margin giving "obstinacy;" and Jerome translating it "scutum cordis," as the text had given ὑπερασπισμον. He represents Adam as holding up this shield when God came nigh, flinging back the blame not only upon the woman, but upon God: "Ut quasi reatum suum oblique in auctorem redideret." Eve also holds up the shield, "Hoc scutum etiam requisita mulier tenuit. . . . ut ipsa quoque reatum suum oblique in creatorem duceret."—"Works," vol. iv., p. 323.

concession is extorted from him, but he will make no frank acknowledgment. It is so with the sinner still. He does precisely what Adam did; no more, till the Holy Spirit lays his hand upon his conscience and touches all the springs of his being. Up till that time he may utter extorted and reluctant *concessions*, but he will not *confess* sin. He will not deal frankly with God. He is sullen, and admits that he is a sinner because others do it,—because it would be thought pride in him not to do it,—because he cannot help it,—because he is conscious there is something wrong; but still there is no open-hearted confession. If there is not actually the "keeping silence" (Ps. xxxii. 3), or the "covering of sin" (Prov. xxviii. 13), there is nothing of the ready spirit: "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions to the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." (Ps. xxxii. 5; Prov. xxviii. 13; Luke xv. 18—21; 1 John i. 9.)

2. The artfulness of an unhumbled sinner. Even while admitting sin, he shakes himself free from blame; nay, he thrusts forward the name of another, even before the admission comes forth, as if to neutralize it before it is made. How artful! yet how common still! Men do not only give a mere reluctant admission,—they do not merely in so doing try to shift the blame from themselves, but they attempt, by introducing the name of another, *before the admission is made*, to give the impression most cunningly that this other is the really guilty person. Thus, by mentioning another first, they hope to draw away all the attention from themselves to him, so that, before their own guilt has been conceded, attention has been directed to him as the guilty one, and thus not only is there a bare admission of guilt instead of an honest confession, but there is a most cunning endeavour to undo that very admission by the peculiar way in which it is made. It is difficult to say whether such a method be more cunning or cowardly. It is certainly the procedure of a man who is, on the one hand, afraid to confess, and, on the other, afraid not to confess, and who compromises these two opposite fears by a most artful declaration, which shows how sorely he shrinks from the consequences of his own poor admission. Ah! where do we find honest, unreserved acknowledgment of sin? Nowhere, save in connexion with pardon. Up till the moment that we learn the "forgiveness that there is with God," there will always be reserve,—a cowardly reluctance to confess, an unmanly shifting of the guilt from off ourselves, a desire

Digitized by Google

to palliate our sins, or lessen their number. There will always be "guile," for there will always be a motive to hide our sins; but when the free pardon comes, it takes away all reserve, it renders us "guileless." We confess freely, for the reasons for restraint are done away. And in coming to receive the pardon, we put forward the name of our Surety first, before even mentioning our sins, that like Adam, though not with his guile, we may call attention to Him on whom we cast our guilt: "For THY NAME'S SAKE, O Lord, pardon mine iniquity, for it is great." (Ps. xxv. 11.)

3. The self-justifying pride of the sinner.* He admits as much of his guilt as cannot be denied, and then takes credit to himself for what he has done. He is resolved to take no more blame than he can help. Even in the blame that he takes, he finds not only an extenuation, but a virtue, a merit; for he fled, because it was not seemly for him to stand before God naked! Nay, even in so much of the blame as he takes, he must divide it with another, thus leaving on himself but little guilt and some considerable degree of merit. Had it not been for another, he would not have had to admit even the small measure of blame that he does! There is pride here, but no godly sorrow; nothing of the "broken spirit;" nay, not even *despair*. His self-righteousness elates him, buoys him up, and makes him think his case not so bad as to be hopeless. Till the sinner sees the cross it will be always so. Law will not humble him. The voice of God will not humble, though it may alarm him. He must see the utter condemnation of himself in the cross, and at the same time God's provision for meeting his case and removing the condemnation ere he will throw away his confidences. It is only the knowledge of the Divine righteousness that can remove either his pride or his shame, just as it is only the knowledge of the "perfect love" that can cast out fear.

4. The hardened selfishness of the sinner.† He accuses others to screen himself. He does not hesitate to inculpate the dearest; he spares not the wife of his bosom. Rather than bear the blame, he will fling it anywhere, whoever may suffer. And all this in a moment! How instantaneous are

* The contrast between this and David's feeling in Ps. li. 4 is very striking. Adam's object was to justify *himself;* David's was to justify *God,*—"That THOU mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest."

† "Verba malitiæ sunt hæc, quibus magis augeas quam deleas culpam." —*Bernard,* Second Homily on Luke i. 26.

Digitized by Google

the results of sin! Already it has rooted out affection, and broken the nearest tie, and made man a being of dark selfishness. He has ceased to "love his neighbour as himself." SELF has now risen uppermost within him. He is steeled against his dearest of kin. He does not hesitate to expose them to the wrath of God; he cares not what their doom may be provided *he* escape! "Hateful, and hating one another," is the inscription on the forehead of our fallen race. It is this that we here read upon the brow of Adam.

5. The sinner's blasphemy and ingratitude to God. "The woman whom thou gavest me," said Adam. God's love in giving him a helpmeet is overlooked, and the gift itself is mocked at. God's earnest pains in providing for him a companion so suitable are forgotten, nay, turned into an occasion for casting the blame of his fall upon Him. Had it not been for *thee*, I should not have sinned;—she whom thou gavest me has become my seducer. *Thou* didst it, in giving me such a companion. Thus it was that Israel taunted God with being the author of their sins and woes (Ezek. xxxiii. 10): "If our transgressions be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live?" That is, "If we die, we must just die; we cannot help it; and God is only mocking us with broken promises, speaking to us of life, yet sending only death." And in reference to this it was that God cleared himself upon oath, refusing to lie under the imputation, or to take the blame of man's death: "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." Thus it is that scoffers in these last days pervert the gifts of God into an excuse for sinning, or into reasons for believing that there is no such thing as sin at all. When we speak of their sin in following their lusts, they ask, "What sin can there be in the indulgence of those desires that God has given? or if there be sin in these things, who is to blame but He who gave them?"

6. The sinner's attempt to smooth over his deed. "The woman gave me the fruit, and I ate of it; that was all. Giving, receiving, and eating a little fruit; that was all! What more simple, natural, innocent? How could I do otherwise?" Thus he glosses over the sin. He speaks smooth things to himself regarding it, and would fain make God think as little of it as he does himself. And so men still trifle with sin. What harm is there in it? What harm is there in the song, the dance, the laugh, the gaiety, the glitter? Are not these amusements *harmless?* Ah! it was

Digitized by Google

thus that the first sinner tried to reason with his God. But did he succeed? Did God accept his plea of harmlessness? Did He turn away his wrath, or dilute the curse, or justify the transgressor? So long as man persists in smoothing down his sin, and trying to make God think as lightly of it as he does himself, he must fail in finding favour. It is not till he acquiesces in God's verdict, and, accepting condemnation as his due, takes the sinner's place before God, that he can hope at all. For all hope to a sinner begins in the acknowledgment of his hopelessness, and in consenting to take his hope, not from the idea that wrath is not his due, but from the knowledge of that wondrous grace that has stretched its blessed circle far beyond the uttermost limits of human sin.

Ver. 13.—"And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done?* And the woman said, The serpent beguiled† me, and I did eat."

The trial proceeds, and the investigation is carried on with all judicial calmness. Adam's sullen answer awakes no wrath, and calls forth no remark. The Lord God now passes on to the woman. She had been accused by the man, and he turns to her to see how the man's accusation stands. He takes him at his word, and proceeds with the inquiry: "What is this that

* The Sept. seem to have read לָמָּה, instead of מַה. Their rendering is, *τί τοῦτο ἐποίησας*; in which they are followed by the Vulgate, "Quare hoc fecisti;" and by Coverdale, "Wherefore hast thou done this?" and the "Bishops' Bible," "Why hast thou done this?" but not by Junius and Tremellius, who give it (as in our own Version), "Quid hoc est quod fecisti." Calvin speaks of the question as "Oratio mirantis ut in re prodigiosa." Mede aptly calls God's question an "inquisition accusing," and the woman's answer, "a confession excusing."

† נָשָׁא. In Hiphil, to lead into error; seduce; corrupt; deceive. As Jer. xxix. 8: "Let not your prophets *deceive* you." The Sept. give, *ἠπάτησε*; Vulg., decepit; Jun. and Tre., seduxit. It is the same word as is used in Ps. lv. 15: "Let death seize upon them;" literally, "Let death beguile them;" that is, stealthily and craftily lay hold of them, as did he who has the power of death, of our first parents. Robertson (Clavis, p. 44) refers also to Ps. lxxxix. 23, "The enemy shall not seduce him" as he did Eve. In 2 Cor. xi. 3, we read, "As the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety," *ἐξηπάτησεν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ*; and in 1 Tim. ii. 14, "Adam was not deceived (*ἠπατήθη*); but the woman being deceived (*ἀπατηθεῖσα*), was in the transgression." In Eph. vi. 11, the apostle speaks of "the wiles (*τας μεθοδειας*) of the devil." Of the Lord Jesus (the woman's seed, and therefore the opposite of the serpent's seed) it is said, "Neither was guile (*δόλος*) found in his mouth" (1 Pet. ii. 22); and of his seed, it is written, that they were like him, "In their mouth was found no guile" (*δολος*). (Rev. xiv. 5.)

Digitized by Google

thou hast done?" Is it really true that thou hast done this thing with which thy husband charges thee?

In Eve we mark the same self-justifying spirit. She does not, indeed, retaliate upon the man, and say, "How am I to blame for *his* sin, seeing he need not have eaten unless he had pleased?" She admits that she had done the deed, though, like her husband, she does so most sullenly, and not by a direct or frank confession. She does not deny the deed, but she will not take the blame. It was the serpent that beguiled her! How could she help it? As if she would thus indirectly cast back the blame on God.* "It was thine own creature, the serpent; he is the real cause; blame *him*, not *me;* why was he allowed to beguile me?"

Thus it is that the sinner refuses to accept the *guilt*, even when he admits the *deed*. He dares not say, I did not do the deed; but he does not hesitate to affirm, "I was not to blame in doing it."† He affirms, either "the sin was not a very great one," or, "there were many excuses for me;" and the greatest of all is this, that "it was a creature of God's own making that seduced me." See how fatally sin works. It makes him a liar,—a liar to his own conscience, to his fellows, to his God. It makes him a coward. It makes him an accuser of others. It makes him a blasphemer of God himself. To own himself totally a sinner,—made so, not by God, nor by any fellow-creature, nor by education, nor by circumstances, but solely by himself,—is what he will not stoop to. Yet on any other terms God cannot deal with him. As a confessed sinner, he may at any moment go to God, assured of finding favour and pardon; but on any other footing approach to God must be wholly in vain. Half-confessions will not do; concealments will not do; extenuations will not do; there must be the full acknowledgment of entire guilt, otherwise God can have no dealings with him at all.

And here, again, let us mark the forbearance of our God.

* "Qui illic intrare serpentem, persuasurum talia, permisisset."—*Jerome* on Lam. iii. 65. "Illa (Eva) quod Dominus serpentem in Paradiso constituisset."—*Ib.* on Prov. xix. 3.

† In all this process of inquiry there is no *grace* manifested. And hence the sinner flies from God, unrepenting and unconfessing. Nor will terror ever do aught but drive a man from God. No amount of it will ever draw him nigh, or unlock his breast, or soften him into repentance. Nothing but *grace* can do this. Besides, terror only appeals to the *coarser* feelings of our nature; grace touches the finer chords. Terror contracts the spirit, grace enlarges it. Terror drives man into the thicket; only grace can draw him out.

Digitized by Google

Even before grace is directly announced to man, we can observe the dawnings of it in the way in which God approaches man, and in the difference between his dealings with man and his dealings with the serpent. How slow to anger! How loth to find the woman guilty! How anxious to hear all that she has to say for herself before pronouncing sentence! How condescending, too, in all this; for he comes himself in person to make the inquiry, not trusting it to another; and comes most graciously to seek after man, when man was fleeing from him; not hastily putting a harsh construction upon his flight, but waiting to hear his excuse and defence; not threatening nor upbraiding, but, in the words of calm and friendly inquiry, asking, "What is this that thou hast done?"

Such is the God with whom we have to do,—"the God of all grace;" not hating, but loving; not cursing, but blessing; not hasty, but slow to anger; not upbraiding, but dealing tenderly; not condemning, but pardoning. How manifestly is this the same God who so loved the world as to give his only-begotten Son! How perfect the harmony of character in this God, from these first words, spoken to fallen man, to the last which his book contains! How blessed to learn that this God, who sought out Adam when he fled from him, is seeking the sinner still, unprovoked by his wanderings and resistances and self-excuses; waiting, with undiminished patience and forbearing love, to receive and to love and to bless!

Ver. 14.—"And the Lord God (*Heb.* Jehovah-Elohim) said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. 15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."*

Though both of these two verses refer, in a measure, to Satan himself, yet they do embrace separate subjects, the former pointing more especially to the curse upon the literal

* שׁוּף,—a word occurring only three times in Scripture,—Job ix. 17; Ps. cxxxix. 11; and in the passage before us. Gesenius wants it to mean, "lie in wait;" in which he is contradicted by his English translator, who says, "bruise" is its meaning. Robertson, M. Stuart, Levi, &c., maintain "bruise" as the sense. The Sept. has τηρησει, and the Vulg., "insidiaberis." Augustine (Jerome also) seems to have adopted "observabis" as the rendering, for he has a long allegorical passage on the way in which the serpent "watches for our heel," and in which he was to "watch for his head," on Psalm civ.

Digitized by Google

serpent, the latter predicting the curse upon the great Tempter.* They seem but one prophecy, and yet they take in two objects,—the near and the distant, the literal and the figurative. Commencing, like all double prophecies, with the near and the literal, they end in the distant and the figurative. As in the Seventy-second Psalm, the singer begins with the actual Solomon and ends with the greater Solomon; and as in several burdens, the Prophet Isaiah begins with the Babylon then in being upon the plain of Shinar, and ends with Babylon the great, upon the seven hills; so is it here. He begins with the serpent, he ends with Satan. The figure used is taken from the serpent; but the prophetic picture thus given concerns a far greater personage. For it is evident that one main object gained by employing such a figure in such a way as is done here, is to bring before us the *personality* of that being who is here introduced to us. The words, no doubt, are *figures*, but they are figures of what is *literal*,—precise and personal. They are not figures of abstractions or principles or truths, but of a *person*. They do not set forth God's condemnation of error or of evil, but his judgment upon a *person*. They do not denote the mere conflict between evil and good, with the triumph of the latter after a brief depression, but they foretel the battle between two *persons*. The nature of the combat is not declared, but the personality and literality of the combatants is vividly, and beyond mistake, set forth.†

This much is plain. Let us now look at the words themselves.

God had, in his dealing with our first parents, proceeded in the way of judicial inquiry, step by step. He had taken nothing for granted, but had calmly questioned them, allow-

* See *Usher's* "Body of Divinity," chap. ix., where, after giving an exposition similar to the above, he says, "If God did punish a poor worm, which had no reason nor will to choose or refuse sin, how much less will he spare us which have both?" "As an argument of the detestableness of the sin, and a constant memorial of it, the abused beast is cursed. Compare Ex. xxi. 28; xxxii. 20; Lev. xx. 15; Gen. ix. 5."—*Bishop Kidder on the Pent.*, vol. i., p. 15.

† German Rationalists, denying the personality of Satan, make this a conflict between the good and evil principles in man! See *Dr. S. F. N. Morus' Comment. Exeg. Hist.*, vol. i., pp. 417—419. The literary scoffers of the age, who set aside the truths of Scripture as overdated and obsolete,—unsuited to an era of intellectual progress,—mock at the personality of the Evil One, talk of "extinct Satans," and treat the ancient belief in the devil's true being as an old fable. If the Bible testimony to a God and a Christ be plain, equally plain is that testimony to the being and personality of Satan. "No God" and "no devil" generally go together.

Digitized by Google

ing them full opportunity of defending themselves; loth to condemn, nay, giving out his accusations simply as questions, no more.* But when he comes to deal with the serpent and with Satan, we find nothing of this. They were dealt with as already condemned, and only waiting their sentence. Such is his grace to man, and such the intimation of his purpose to deal with him in grace, not in judgment. Wondrous contrast between the two races of creatures and His purposes concerning them! With the one all is grace, with the other all is righteousness and wrath! Even in the lower creation this difference is shown. That animal that had sided with Satan, and become his instrument in ruining man, is cursed with Satan's curse, and for *Satan's sin;* while the other animals are cursed with a less heavy and less abiding curse, and that for *man's sin.*† As if God would thus from the beginning proclaim the pre-eminent guilt of every ally of the Evil One; and the swift doom of all that, in the day of doom, shall be found upon his side. The serpent was but the involuntary agent, yet he was cursed; how much more they who have "yielded their members instruments of unrighteousness unto sin" (Rom. vi. 13),‡ nay, "run greedily" in the way of the Evil One.

Though the serpent was but the instrument, yet he is

* "Serpens vero jam non requiritur, quia nec ejus pœnitentia quærebatur."—*Jerome.* "As for the serpent, he vouchsafes not to ask him one question, nor to expect what he should say for himself; but presently, without examination, proceeds to judgment against him."—*Mede,* Works, p. 221. See *Usher's* "Divinity," p. 168.

† Satan's connexion with the serpent is a subject of great difficulty. The serpent's punishment was on account of Satan's sin, not man's sin. Hence the heavier curse,—a curse not only heavier in itself, but longer in duration, not removed even in millennial days, when blessing returns to the rest of creation. (Isa. lxv. 25.) Dust shall *still* be the serpent's meat. "Dum plenam naturæ integræ ac bene constitutæ instaurationem promittit sub Christi regno inter alia commemorat, pulverem serpenti pro pane futurum esse."—*Calvin.* We think it may be made a question whether the animal creation at large were cursed for *man's sin* or for *Satan's sin.* No doubt they were involved in the former, but still was it not for their participation in the latter, through their representative the serpent, the wisest of them all, that they have fallen under the curse. Is not this implied in the words, "Thou art cursed *above all cattle*"? &c. The ground is said to be cursed for man's sake, as it was by eating its fruit that he fell; but the animals seem cursed on Satan's account, as they were connected with his temptation. Yet in the end they are separated from him and his doom, and made to share the grace in store for man, their head and king.

‡ The word "yield" poorly expresses the Greek *παρίστημι,* which forcibly implies the willing, nay eager, *presentation* of our members to be the instruments of sin.

Digitized by Google

cursed.* And the words, "above all cattle," &c., imply that the rest of the animal creation were made to share the curse which had come down upon it as Satan's special agent in the plot against man. And why this universal curse?

1. *To show the spreading and contaminating nature of sin.* One sin is enough to spread over a world. There is something in the very nature of sin that infects and defiles. It is not like a stone dropped in a wilderness, upon the sand, there to lie motionless and powerless. It is like that same stone cast into a vast waveless lake, which raises ripple upon ripple, and sends its disturbing influence abroad, in circle after circle, for miles on every side, till the whole lake is in motion. We do not understand the activities and energies of sin. We are slow to credit them. Still less do we understand or believe the strange connexion between one sinning creature and another; so that it seems unrighteous to us that one should involve another in evil. Yet it is evident that there is such a thing as a union, not only of nature, but of *responsibility.* I do not profess to explain this. But God proceeds upon it as *a law of being.* The passage before us takes it for granted; nay, the whole Bible assumes it. It is not some casual or some arbitrary proceeding. It is the law, the righteous law of creaturehood, which unfolding itself first in the curse, has consummated its development in the blessing, when "He was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."†

* "Shrunk from its erect and probably lofty stature; deprived of its limbs; reduced to grovel on the earth and seek its food in the dust; mute henceforth and abject; the baneful serpent sunk beneath this awful curse, and glided away to hide itself out of sight; and from that day the miserable reptile has ever slunk from the eye of man."—*Head's* "World and its Creator," p. 124. See also *Mede's* Works, pp. 230—232. *Endeman* thinks that the literal punishment on the serpent was confined to the individual serpent that was Satan's instrument. (*Institutiones Theologiæ Dogmaticæ*, vol. i., p. 304.) But we can hardly reconcile this with Isaiah lxv. 25. In these figures of the *humiliation* of the serpent, we read the *utter humiliation* of the Tempter himself. The *posture* and the *food* of the serpent most aptly set forth the present degradation of the Evil One, just as the remaining words denote his final ruin. Jerome remarks, that the serpent was to be the only animal not nourished by the death of other animals, for it was to feed upon dust. He tries to allegorize this, and succeeds but poorly. On Isa. lxv. 25, "All its food has the flavour of dust."—*Medrash Rabbah*, quoted by *De Sola* in his recent edition of Genesis, with a Translation and Notes, p. 10.

† We cannot in this place discuss the doctrine of the imputation of sin or righteousness. This much we may say, that not only does the Bible assume them, but they are evidently wrapt up in the history of man.

Digitized by Google

2. *To show how all the manifold parts of creation hang together and depend upon each other.* One being displaced, all are ruined. There is a unity in creation which we have not yet learned to understand,—a unity of the closest kind, yet quite compatible with individual responsibility and separate action. The arch is not more dependent on the keystone than are the different parts of creaturehood dependent on each other for stability and perfection. It is as if the unity of the Godhead had its counterpart in the unity of creation. And, strange to say, it is the fall that has so fully discovered this oneness and made us acquainted with its manifold relations.

3. *To be a monument of the evil of sin.** Sin needs something visible, something palpable, to make known both its existence and its "exceeding sinfulness." It must exhibit itself to our senses. It must stand forth to view, branded with the stroke of God's judgment, as the abominable thing which he hates. Thus He has strewed the memorials of sin all over the earth. He has affixed them to things animate and inanimate, that we may see and hear and feel the vileness and the bitterness of the accursed thing. Before God

Why is disease transmitted? Why does woman suffer in childbirth? Why do infants die? Because sin has been imputed. There has been previous guilt somewhere. Many admit the transmission of evil, but deny the transference of guilt. Now we may ask, could there be the transmission of evil, if there were not a transmission of guilt? Would the one be a righteous thing without the other? However difficult it may be to demonstrate the justice of making guilt transmissible, yet it is much more difficult to prove the justice of transmitting suffering, if the transmission of guilt be unrighteous. That law of being which transmits suffering or death can only be just upon the supposition of a previous law of being, transmitting guilt. Hence it is not the compensation afforded us in Christ's righteousness that makes the imputation of Adam's sin an equitable thing. But it is the great original law of creaturehood as to the transmission of moral and legal liabilities that makes both of these strictly and truly righteous.

* "Because the excellency and sagacity of the serpent had been the occasion of man's confusion, by being made the lying counterfeit of the devil's excellency and wisdom, and the mask whereby he so covered his vileness that the woman took him not to be as he was indeed; therefore God in his wisdom thought good to change the copy, and henceforth to blur and deface that unhappy physiognomical letter, and, by abasing the serpent for the time to come, to make him an everlasting emblem and monument wherein man might hieroglyphically read the malice, vileness, and execrable baseness of that wicked spirit that had beguiled him; to hate him (as now we do the serpent) with mortal hatred, and by his unlucky fortune to expect the devil's deadly destiny. In a word, that which was once used for a mask to cover the devil's knavery, should for the future be a glass wherein to behold his villany."—*Mede*, p. 229.

Digitized by Google

can proceed to unfold his purpose of pardon, he must rear upon the soil of earth an enduring monument of sin, that thereafter there may be no mistake on the part of man; that it may never be supposed that in being gracious to the sinner he was trifling with the sin.*

While the serpent is thus cursed above all the rest of creation, he is made to understand the reason why he is so dealt with. "Because thou hast done this." God takes care that there shall be no mistake. The curse is no accidental and no arbitrary evil; it is traceable to one distinct cause. The serpent has beguiled man, and therefore judgment lights upon it. "The curse causeless shall not come." "Because thou hast done this," is God's preface to his sentence on the serpent.† It is his preface to the judgment pronounced upon the sinner. Because thou hast done this, are the awful words with which he will be sent into the everlasting fire.

Such is the *visible* curse on the serpent. Let us now mark (ver. 15) the *invisible* curse on Satan. There was to be from that moment, war between Satan and the woman, enmity between his seed and her seed.‡ Nay, there was to be warfare,—open warfare. This warfare would consist of two great parts or stages. In the first, the woman's seed would be wounded; in the second, the serpent would be destroyed. The length of his warfare is not stated; or how near its two great parts might be to each other. They might be near, or they might be far off,—we are not told, for it was not needful that we should learn this at first. Simply the two things are presented to us, but the question of time is kept out of view, that, from the very first, there might be not merely a looking for the arrival of the woman's seed, but also a *watching* for him. We get here but the far-off glimpse of a great mountain-range. Its lofty peaks seem all clustered together, as if there were not a step between: yet, when we reach

* Calvin understands literally (in the first place) the enmity predicted as an enmity between man and serpents; and thus, by our natural horror at the sight of a serpent, the remembrance of our fall is called up. "Renovatur defectionis nostræ memoria."

† "God looks upon the devil as the first author of all the unbelief, rebellion, and apostasy of man."—*Hughes* on Genesis, p. 37.

‡ That "the seed of the woman" means also the Church" (see *Turrettine's* Works, vol. ii., p. 231; though he shows that it means Christ "*primario et κατ' εξοχην*," p. 241). *Kidder* asserts that the "serpent's seed" means "evil spirits;" without proof, however, as these are never called his *seed* (though we read of the devil and his angels), whereas wicked men are called so. (John viii. 41, 44.)

Digitized by Google

them, as now in their last days we have done, we find them separated from each other by valleys, and plains, and precipices of vast extent and height. We could not gather from the brief words of this verse, whether the battle was to be the conflict of a day or of ten thousand years. After-ages were to unroll the detail; to reveal to us the suffering and the triumph, the shame and the glory. So closely are the first and second comings of the Lord here brought together, that we should have supposed that there was no interval between them.

But though the times and seasons were not given, and therefore much was hidden from man, yet enough was told to let him know that God had taken his part against his enemy; that Divine love had interposed and pledged itself to the final discomfiture of Satan, and the final blessedness of the victim which he had counted on as his own. Here sounds the first note of gladness in the ear of man. It sounds in many respects indistinctly and inarticulately; but in this respect, at least, is it most distinct and articulate, that it announces the free love of God, and that free love, not simply as displayed in the sending of a deliverer, but as making for itself a righteous approach to man through the sufferings of that deliverer himself. *Now* the great thought of God's heart, the idea of *grace*, began to be unfolded, not only to man but to the universe. But, oh, what a mighty apparatus requires to be constructed ere that one idea can be made plain, and man trusted with it! What an apparatus must be raised (and that, gradually, age after age) for carrying out as well as for exhibiting the whole adjustment of righteousness and grace, holiness and grace, wrath and grace, punishment and grace, ere the sinner can be made to comprehend the new, the strange idea, or to distinguish it from mere indifference to sin, or be trusted with the application of it to himself. This was the first step to the unfolding of "the mystery which was hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ; that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Eph. iii. 9—11.) And it is in reference to this that the epistle thus concludes, "Unto him be glory IN THE CHURCH, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." (Eph. iii. 21.) And at the consummation of the glorious mystery shall this song be sung, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!" (Rom. xi. 33.)

Digitized by Google

Having briefly sketched the meaning of these two verses, let us now look at them more in detail. They are too important to be slightly passed over. They contain the root of all redemption-truth.

1. *Let us mark how God proceeds in his inquiries after sin.* He first traces it out step by step, tracks it in all its windings, ere he utters one word of judgment. His dealings hitherto had been with Adam, as the head of creation. Therefore he speaks first to him. Then from Adam sin is traced to the woman, then from the woman to the serpent. By this process it was brought solemnly before the conscience of the transgressors, that they might *see* what they had done. In this process God takes no advantage of the sinner. He does not make use of his omniscience or omnipotence to convict or overawe the sinner, or to extort confession from him. He proves all by the sinner's own admission, that his mouth may be stopped, and that the Judge may be acknowledged as righteous in all he does; that he may not only be the just God, but that he may be *seen* to be so by his creatures. (See Job xxxiv. 23; Ps. li. 4; Rom. iii. 4.) And as is the process of inquiry, so is the judgment. The sentence is judicially announced, not in anger, but in righteousness. Having traced the sin to its source, God begins with the serpent, the source of the evil, or rather with Satan and the serpent jointly, as the twofold source. He began with the transgressor in his inquiry, he begins with the Tempter in his judgment; for the first word of condemnation must be directed against the originator of sin, the first stroke of wrath must fall on the prime mover of the deed. Thus, even in the minutest things, showing his truth and justice! Even in the *order* of judgment, how careful to mark his sense of the different kinds of criminality! Such is a specimen of the way in which He will judge the world in righteousness!

2. *Let us mark the circumstances in which the sentence was given.* It was given in the hearing of our parents. It was not specially directed to them. They were but *hearers.* Yet the scene was designed for them. This curse on the serpent was spoken in their ears, because it contained in it God's purpose of grace towards them. God's design was, that they should learn his gracious intentions without delay, and thus their fears be quieted and their confidence in God restored, but still that they should learn them in a way which should completely humble them, and make them feel that the grace did not arise from anything in themselves. They learn this grace of God in a sort of side way, as if God turned away his

Digitized by Google

face when making it known. They get it in the form of a curse against the serpent for the evil done by him, thereby learning that the evil done must all be undone before man can be blest! This awful curse against the being that had ruined them intimated such things as these; (1.) That God meant to save them, and not to give them up to the snares of their enemy; (2.) That they could only be saved by their enemy being destroyed; (3.) That this destruction would be attended with toil, and conflict, and wounds; (4.) That it was easy to ruin a world, but hard to save and restore. How affecting the thought, that God could not preach the Gospel directly to Adam, but that he must be left to gather it from the curse against the Evil One,—as if he could not be trusted with the full glad tidings of grace till he had learned the exceeding sinfulness of sin! How different now, with us! God preaches that Gospel directly to the sinner in all its largeness; saying to each of us, There is grace enough for thee, come thou and be reconciled, come thou and be saved!

3. *Let us mark how God hated that which Satan had done.** "Because thou hast done this," are the words of awful preface to the sentence. God had no pleasure in the snare or the ruin it had wrought. He had no satisfaction in the marring of his handiwork, no pleasure in the death of the sinner, no joy in the desolation of his world. His words are the expression of deep displeasure against him who had done the horrid deed, and at the deed which had been done. And let us not forget that all which Satan has since then been doomed to suffer, as well as all that he shall hereafter suffer, has its origin here. "Because thou hast done this!" No doubt he was ruined and doomed before for his own transgression; but now he is to be sunk to a lower level of condemnation, and loaded with a weightier curse for being the Tempter of man, the destroyer of a world. This is the brand upon his burning forehead; this is the millstone round his neck. God will have him understand how He abhorred that which he had done. And when hereafter he is seized, and bound, and shut up by the strong angel in the abyss, shall not these words ring in his ears as he is thrust

* *Bernard* notices, that on Adam *one* curse was pronounced, on Eve two; but on the serpent *three,*—his going on his belly, his eating dust, his being crushed by the woman's seed.—*De Pass. Dom. Ch.* xxx. Calvin, in explaining why the literal serpent should share the curse, uses the simile of a father abhorring the very sword by which one of his children had been slain. He further shows that this is not really more incongruous than inflicting punishment upon our *bodies,* which are but *instruments* of the soul in sinning, as was the serpent.

Digitized by Google

down into his dwelling of darkness, "Because thou hast done this"? His sin, by means of which he succeeded in casting man out of Eden, shall be the sin by which he himself shall be cast wholly out of earth, to deceive the nations no more.

4. *In undoing the evil God begins at its source.* The drying up of the stream will not do; the source must be reached. If man is to be saved at all, it must be by the removal of sin; and if sin is to be removed, God must begin at the very root. There must be a complete undoing of the evil—an undoing which shall not only sweep off the actual sin, with its sad results, but which shall strike at the very nature of sin itself. Thus God's hatred of sin is the foundation of the sinner's deliverance; and no deliverance can be sure or permanent, if not founded upon this. God's purpose of grace does not treat sin as a light thing, but as an infinite evil, which must be met at its first uprising; nay, which can only be rightly met, when met there. Grace cannot come forth to the sinner, save in connexion with the utter condemnation of the sin. There can be no true love to the sinner, which does not extirpate and utterly make away with the sin. Sin was the real enemy, and love to the sinner must proceed at once against this enemy, not resting till it is utterly destroyed.

5. *God shows that Satan shall not be allowed to triumph.* He has gained a mighty advantage, but his victory is only temporary and partial. God is seen interposing and setting his face against the adversary. God is taking the sinner's side; and this is the assurance that Satan's victory shall be reversed! His doom is sealed. Degradation, shame, ruin, are his portion. What might have been his doom hitherto on account of his former sin we know not; but here we learn the superadded penalty which he was henceforth to bear. Man hears the condemnation of his enemy, and knows that this defeat is his deliverance. And of this he is to have a *visible pledge* in the serpent's form and habits. This very curse upon the serpent is the declaration to man of his own deliverance from the curse, for it is God's declaration of displeasure against the enemy that had seduced him. Thus Satan's ruin and the sinner's deliverance are bound up together. It was to "destroy the works of the devil" that the Son of God was to come; nay, it was "to destroy him that had the power of death, even the devil." And we now, in these days, know that he has come. He has done his mighty work. He has led captivity captive.

6. *God himself undertakes man's cause.* "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her

Digitized by Google

seed."* It is not, "there shall be enmity;" but "I will put it." God himself will now proceed to work for man. The serpent's malice and success have but drawn forth the deeper love and more direct interposition in man's behalf.

7. *God promises a seed to the woman.*† All that this implied she could not know at the time. But it is evidently declared, that she was not to die immediately. The sentence, "in the day thou eatest thou shalt die," was to be suspended in so far as death temporal was concerned. She was to have a seed, and that said, Thou art not to die immediately.‡ This suspension was, of itself, an intimation of grace. The seed of the woman might be supposed to be three. First, there is the whole race of man. Secondly, there is the Church. Thirdly, there is the Messiah. To this last, more especially, does the promise point. On Him, as the woman's seed, he sought to fix man's eye from the beginning. Through him deliverance was to come. For whatever might be the mystery hanging over this, still, it was indicated that it was in this way, and through this seed, that sin was to be undone. The woman's seed was to be God's instrument in destroying Satan, and avenging the wrong he had done to man. Here let us mark, (1.) The honour put upon the woman, even though she was first in transgression.§ This is grace indeed,—grace in its largeness. And, thus while the woman is taught not to be overmuch cast down, the man is hindered from triumphing over her. (2.) The confounding of Satan. It is the seed of his victim that is to be his destroyer. It is thus that he is put to shame, and the success of his wiles made the means of his own ruin. His triumph is his destruction. (3.) The directing of the Church's eye to a *person* as the instrument of blessing; nay, to a *man*,—very flesh and blood. The salvation was to come *from God*, and yet it was to come *through man.*

* In one of the Epistles, falsely ascribed to Jerome, there is a remark, which may be noticed, on the expression, "I will put." The writer adverts to its being said, "I will put," not "I put," or "have put," lest it should be supposed that Eve was meant personally: "Non certe *pono* dicit, ne ad Evam hoc pertinere videretur." The use which the unknown writer makes of this is a curious one. It is to show that it must refer to the Virgin Mary!

† How *literally* was this fulfilled in the Son of Mary! He was the seed of the *woman*, not of the man.

‡ Hence to Messiah himself, the promise was, "He shall see his *seed*, he shall prolong his days." Is. liii. 10.

§ May we not say, that thus the man was *reproved* for casting blame upon the woman? He was prevented from boasting. If the woman had the dishonour of being the chief transgressor, she had the honour of being the instrument of deliverance.

Digitized by Google

8. *God is to put enmity between the serpent and the woman, and between the serpent's seed and the woman's seed.** The woman and the serpent had joined together in rebellion, and so long as this friendship lasted there could be no hope for her or for the race. But God steps in to break this bond. This "covenant with death shall be disannulled, and this agreement with hell shall not stand." The woman and the serpent had been fellow-accomplices; but henceforth this league was to be broken. As if God had said to the Tempter, "Thou hast beguiled her to be an accomplice with thee against me, and thou thinkest to get her seed to join thee; but it shall not be so. I will break the alliance. I will not only separate between thee and her, but I will raise up deadly hatred."† Let us notice here such things as these. (1.) The enmity between Satan and the Church. There can be no friendship with him, and no sympathy with his works. Thus the distinction between the Church and the world is as old as Eden; and it is not merely distinction, it is hostility. (2.) The enmity between Christ and Satan; between him who is the representative of heaven and him who is the representative of hell; between him who is the friend and him who is the enemy of man. (3.) The name given to the ungodly,—"the seed of the serpent." And it was this expression that Christ took up when he spoke of the "generation of vipers," and said to the unbelieving Jews, "Ye are of your father the devil." ‡ By birth we are the serpent's brood till grace transforms us and we become the woman's seed; then our friendship with the accursed race is for ever broken. (4.) The name of the Church,—"The seed of the woman." Yes, the seed of her who sinned, who "was in the transgression,"—offspring of Eve,—of her who was first in apostasy. What tender favour is thus shown to her! (5.) The name of Christ. The same as the Church's, the "seed of the woman." Yes, he was indeed "born of a woman,"—the son of Mary, —the son of Eve,—the son of her that had transgressed. We sometimes wonder that Jesus should have allowed such names as Tamar, and Rahab, and Bathsheba to be in the roll of his

* "The seed of the serpent (says Moses Stuart), or the children of the devil, was a common expression among the Jews, to designate those who were like him in the temper of their minds." (Is. viii. 44; 1 John iii. 8, 10; Matt. xiii. 38; Acts xiii. 10.)—*Hebrew Chrestomathy*, p. 149.

† "God hath firmly set that enmity between Satan and the woman's seed."—*Hughes on Genesis*, p. 38.

‡ The Apostle John also says, "he that committeth sin is of the devil,"—*ἐκ τôυ διαβόλου ἐστίν*, just as he says, *ἐκ τôυ θεου*, and again he speaks of "the children of the devil" (1 John iii. 8, 10,) *τὰ τέκνα τôυ διαβόλου.*

Digitized by Google

ancestors; but is not all this implied in his being called at the outset, the seed of the woman? What grace is there in his taking to himself such a name! What oneness with us does such a name imply. Ah, surely he is not ashamed to call us brethren! Truly the Son of Man did come to seek and to save that which was lost!

9. *There is not only to be enmity but conflict.** That these two parties should keep aloof from each other was not enough. There must be more than this. There must be alienation and hatred; nay there must be warfare, and that of the most desperate kind. Satan and the Church must ever be at open warfare. The world and the Church must ever be foes to each other. It cannot be otherwise. No concession, no compromise, can ever make it otherwise, or alter the declared purpose of Jehovah. Neither Satan nor the world can change. They may hide their vileness, they may mask their hatefulness, and seek to win us with flattery, or beguile us with lies; but they change not. They are still "from beneath," not "from above;" and woe be to us, if by silence, or unfaithfulness, or compliance, we dishonour our Lord before them, and act unworthy of our calling, and name, and hope.†

The beginning of this warfare we see in Cain and Abel. Its progress we find in the history of succeeding ages. In Christ himself we see that warfare at its height. Since then it has still proceeded,—and perhaps more than before, in the open field. Babylon was Satan's citadel at first, round which his armies were gathered, and from which, as from a centre, he assailed the Church, in her citadel, which, in former days, was exclusively Jerusalem. In each of the seats of the four successive monarchies Satan found a citadel. These were his four great encampments, from which he launched his squadrons against the army of the living God. Especially in the last of these empires has he found at once a city and a fortress, from which he assails the hated followers of the Lamb, and "wears out the saints of the Most High;" shedding their blood like water, and scattering their bones upon the earth. In a threefold form does this great Anti-christian armament take the field,—as Paganism, as Popery, as Infidelity,—the last the most terrible of all, as the product and combination of the others,—the concentration and em-

* *Turrettine* brings out the *personal* character of this conflict, as between Christ and Satan. He calls it *singularis quaedam monomachia.* Vol. ii., p. 241.

† Utrinque debuit esse pugna—says *Turrettine.* Ib. 242.

Digitized by Google

bodiment of all the various forms of evil from the beginning. In its ranks will be found "the seed of the serpent" in fullest development,—the truest offspring of the Evil One, to which earth has given birth.

This conflict is made up of two great parts,—two events, each of which is the crisis of a long series preceding, and the commencement of another series arising out of it. They are widely different in their nature, though forming part of one great development. They are thus referred to by our Lord, "ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory" (Luke xxiv. 26); and by the Apostle Peter, when he speaks of "the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow" (1 Pet. i. 11); and, again, when he speaks of himself as a "witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed." (1 Pet. v. 1.) They form the two mighty events, known to us as the first and second comings of the Lord,—the first coming embracing that part of the conflict which consists in his "suffering," the second coming embracing that which is consummated in his "glory." Let us notice the two divisions.

1. *The bruising of the heel of the woman's seed.** It is not the *woman's* heel that is to be bruised, but the heel of *her seed*; neither is it the *woman* that is to bruise the serpent's head, but *her seed*;—"it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."† It was an inferior part that was to be wounded, not a vital one. Yet still there was to be a wound. The serpent's seed was to have a temporary triumph, and this was fulfilled when Jesus hung on the cross. Then the heel was bruised. Then Satan seemed to conquer. That was the hour and power of darkness. Then "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." Then that wound was given which defeated him who gave it, and began our victory. Thus it was that the Church was taught to look forward to the "bruised heel," and out of that symbol to gather the great truth which alone can heal the conscience, that God had provided a *substitute*, by the shedding of whose blood there was to be deliverance. It was not

* The serpent, as it were, cunningly steals behind and seizes the *heel*. (See Gen. xlix. 17.) "The serpent," says Turrettine, "can only lay hold on and bite the heel, that is, the humanity and flesh of Christ, by which he trod the earth, and by means of temptations, persecutions, and death, afflict him, &c." Thus it is also, he adds, with believers. The old serpent bites their heels. (Vol. ii., p. 242.)

† It is not "*she* shall bruise thy head;" but "it" or "he," הוא. It was not to be Eve herself, or any daughter of Eve. And this was perfectly understood all along from the beginning.

Digitized by Google

salvation by mere love that was taught; it was not salvation by mere incarnation; it was salvation by *sacrificial substitute*,—salvation by *vicarious bloodshedding*,—salvation by a surety's endurance and exhaustion of the penalty which was our due. In no other way could love find its way to us, and in no other could our consciences have been pacified. The "bruised heel" was not the mere display of love; it was *the judicial removal of the righteous barrier*, which would otherwise have for ever hindered that love from reaching the sinner. In the man with the "bruised heel" we see the sinner's substitute, and, at the same time, the sinner's pattern,—his "leader and commander." We are followers of the man with the bruised heel! Let us not be ashamed of him, or of his cross! Let us not expect for ourselves anything better than he had to pass through. Tribulation was his entrance into the kingdom. It must also be ours. The servant is not greater than his Lord.

2. *The bruising of the serpent's head.** It was his most vital as well as his most honourable part that was to be bruised. An intimation this of utter defeat and ruin. He has received many a stroke. His deadly wound was given upon the cross, in that very stroke by which he bruised the heel of the woman's seed. So that from that moment our victory was secure. But the final blow is reserved for the Lord's second coming. Then it is that the great dragon, that old serpent, is to be bound in chains, and shut up in the abyss. And it is to that day of triumph that the apostle's words specially refer, "the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." †

Such was the curse upon the Tempter; such the glad tidings to man which it contained; such the grace it manifested; such the victory which it pledged; and such the

* There is evident reference to this not only in Rom. xvi. 20, but in the promise to Messiah (Ps. xci. 13), "thou shalt tread upon the *adder* . . . the *dragon* shalt thou trample under feet;" and in the promises to the apostles, "they shall take up *serpents*," &c. (Mark xvi. 18), and especially in Luke x. 18, 19, where, after saying, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," our Lord adds, "behold, I give you power to tread on SERPENTS AND SCORPIONS, AND OVER ALL THE POWER OF THE ENEMY," as if he would say, "I, the seed of the woman, the bruiser of the serpent's head, delegate this power of mine to you; I who am specially appointed to carry on the enmity between the two seeds, *I* give you power over *the enemy*."

† Rungius brings out from this passage three things respecting the person of Christ; 1st, his divinity, inasmuch as he was to bruise the serpent's head; 2d, his humanity, inasmuch as his heel was to be bruised; 3d, his birth of the Virgin, as being the seed of the woman. (P. 203.)

Digitized by Google

process through which that triumph was to be reached. It was this display of an infinite but most unexpected grace that made Adam throw aside his fig-leaves, leave his thicket, and draw nigh to God. He could have expected only avenging wrath; he meets with pardoning love; love that would not rest till it had undone all the evil that had been brought into the world by man's sin; that would spare no cost, not even the blood of the only begotten of the Father, in accomplishing this end; and would press forward through every enemy and every barrier, till it had taken the spoil from the mighty, and delivered the lawful captive; till it had overthrown the adversary in righteous battle; till it had won back man and man's forfeited inheritance; till it had compensated for all the dishonours done to God by Satan's victory; nay, till it had secured glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good-will to man.*

Notes on Scripture.

NOTES ON THE PSALMS.

Psalm LVI.

The reason why fear gains ascendancy in a believing soul on occasions of danger and trouble is sententiously expressed by Augustine, "*Magnitudinem mali vides, potestatem medici non vides.*" The faith which penetrates the unseen reaches the case. This Psalm, in vers. 1, 2, sets forth perils and evils in their magnitude, every day felt, every day receiving their vigorous assaults; but vers. 3, 4, declare the remedy.

"*In the day of my fear, I will trust in thee.*"—(Ver. 3.)

This is nothing less than the voice of the Master, of Him who said in John xiv. 1, 27, "Let not your heart be troubled, believe in God;"

* In this first promise, which so fully contains the Gospel, not one word is said of anything being done by *man*. He is set aside, and God does everything for him. "Salvation is of the Lord." Man stands still and beholds it. The Gospel is no command enjoining us to do anything; it is God's declaration that He has done all for us. *Rungius* puts this well here. After stating that this passage contains "the sum of the Gospel," he shows that thus this Gospel is no new *law* enjoining anything to be done; "sed est vox læti nuncii et consolationis, docens non quid nobis agendum sit, sed quid Deus, nostri causa, fecerit." (P. 202.)

Digitized by Google

"Peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid."

"God I will extol—his Word."—(Ver. 4.)

I will rest my heart in God; I will praise God (אֲהַלֵּל בְּ, as in Psalm xliv. 9, and as in ver. 10 again); I will praise God with a special reverence to "*his Word*"—his promises, which are not like those of the world. *David* might refer to the Lord's special promise to him of the *seed* that was to come,—a promise that of course implied his preservation in order to its accomplishment. The *Son of David* had his eye on that same promise in another of its aspects, its implied engagement to supply strength and give victory. Every believing one, in hours of darkness, reverts to that promise, saying to his soul, "He that spared not his own Son, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" It is thus that the Lord "*magnifies his Word,*" making it felt to be the prominent and most attractive to sinful men of all his ways of revealing Himself. (Psalm cxxxviii. 2.)

The world goes on, adding sin to sin. The world goes on, seeking daily to overthrow God by overthrowing his people; even as it sought to overthrow God by overthrowing his Son. (Ver. 5, 6.) But

"Shall they escape by (עַל) *iniquity?"*—(Ver. 7.)

They have made a covenant with death and hell; shall it stand? No; if they were to escape by their iniquity, by their boldness in defying God, this would be a result wholly unlike the past dealings of God.

"God, in anger, has brought down the nations."—(Ver. 7);

and will do so on that day when their anger is hot against Him. (Rev. xi. 18.)

On the other hand, He has never failed to take account of the wanderings and the tears of his own. Their נֹד, and his נֹאד, correspond so far, that every tear shed by them in their wanderings is in that bottle of his, as if He had travelled along with them through their wilderness and never suffered one drop to reach the ground. His bottle—his book of remembrance—has preserved these precious tears; and if so, what good reason have we for exultation (ver. 9—11) and for reiterating

"God I will extol—the Word!" *

I will praise Jehovah, and why? that "*Word,*" already referred to, ver. 4, explains all. He has spoken, He has promised; all shall go on well, and then shall come the glorious issue—

"I shall walk before God
In the light of the living."—(Ver. 13.)

* Fry suggests, "God shall be the theme of my praise; *He hath spoken;*" דִּבֵּר.

Digitized by Google

Which surely carries us forward to New Jerusalem days, when He who is "*Life*," and who, by being so, is "the *Light* of man," shall walk with his redeemed in the kingdom. He Himself is the grand example of this. His every tear was precious, his every step was marked; the book of remembrance has a record of these so vast and ample and full, that, were it published here, "I suppose the world itself could not contain the volumes that could be written." He arose on the third day, "walking in the light of the living;" no more a prisoner in the darkness of the grave; no more subjected to the gloom of his Father's wrath; no more walking through the dark valley where love was withheld; entering on the endless brightness of Divine favour at the right hand. A believer's course resembles his, ending, too, in this unclouded noon of resurrection glory.

One point we have not noticed. The title of this Psalm is peculiar. It is "*Michtam*," in common with Psalm xvi. (which see) and many others; but also it is "Upon *Jonath-elem-rechokim*." Hengstenberg renders this, "*The silent dove among strangers;*" which certainly well expresses the substance of the Psalm, as being the breathing of One who returned not reviling for reviling, but moaned his sorrows in the ear of his God. Still, since we have reason to think that these titles all refer to something in the music to which the psalms were set, especially when עַל, "Upon," is prefixed, we incline to think that these words indicate somewhat of the instrument and the tune—no doubt, however, a tune and an instrument suited to the subject, and used on occasions of melancholy interest, such as "Dove among strangers" may suggest. In either view the title corresponds to what we gather up as the substance of the Psalm, written by inspiration, when David had put himself into the hands of the Philistines, and was "sore afraid." (1 Sam. xxi. 12.)

The Righteous One amid his wanderings anticipating final rest.

Psalm LVII.

We spoke of the title of last Psalm as peculiar, and as suitable to the theme handled. We may say the same of the title of this Psalm, "*Al-taschith*," *i.e.*, destroy not; for it is equally suitable, whether taken as a musical term or as indicating the spirit breathed throughout. We do not, however, think that it is taken from Deut. ix. 26, nor yet from 1 Sam. xxvi. 9, where the sentiment occurs addressed in the one case to God, in the other to man. We suspect it is a musical term of some sort, pointing to the manner of employing the ode,—the "*Ære perennius*," the "indestructible," being common to all nations as an epithet of poetic and musical compositions.

Christ is the chief Speaker, entering into his own difficulties and those of his Church. The tone is such as we find in John xii. 27, 28, "Father, save me! Father, glorify thy name!" In ver. 1, the calamities, or rather the "mischiefs" (הַוּוֹת), of a malicious world

Digitized by Google

and a malicious hell are spoken of, but spoken of in order to fix our attention on the means of victory. It is, ver. 2, "God *Most High,*" God "who *accomplishes all things,*" in spite of foes;* it is God, too, doing this with "*mercy and truth,*"—the attributes that distinguish redemption, kindness to the guilty, in consistency with his adherence to everything his mouth has uttered. As for men, they are as lions, in violence; or if you refer to their secret ways, they are equally to be distrusted. (Vers. 4, 6.) Let me not fall into their hands. But God, God in his glory, let me ever be in his hands (vers. 5, 7); my heart is fixed, my glory (*i.e.*, my soul) bursts into song, "I awake the morning dawn" to sing his praises. For full is He of tender mercy above the heavens, as well as of truth unto the clouds,—*mercy and truth* (as ver. 3) shining bright in all his redemption-acts. The issue must be glory to Himself, infinite glory, glory above the heavens, glory above all the earth. A flood of glory is to cover this earth above its highest mountains; nay, to cover heaven, too, above its loftiest pinnacles. The eye of the Psalmist is gazing now on the ages to come in the new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. David "in the cave," in the very presence of Saul, was taught by the Holy Spirit thus to sing for his own use, and the use of the Church, and the use of the Son of man in the days of his flesh,

The Righteous One connecting his deliverance with Jehovah's glory.

Psalm LVIII.

The Righteous One reasons with the ungodly in prospect of their doom. It is another "Al-taschith" and "Michtam," as to its musical accompaniments. A difficulty meets us in ver. 1, some rendering the Hebrew, by a change in one letter, (viz., אֵלִים for אֵלֶם,) "Ye mighty ones, do ye speak righteousness?" others retaining אֵלֶם as a verb, "Is justice then silent?" or, "Are ye, then, indeed dumb, so that ye will not speak what is right?"

It is addressed to "*the sons of men*" (ver. 1), not to rulers only, though to rulers also, as being among the sons of men. (See Psalm lxxxii. 6.)

> "*The wicked are alienated* (from God) *from the womb;*
> *The speakers of falsehood have gone astray as soon as they are born.*" (Ver. 3.)

They are of the "seed of *the serpent;*" and, like the adder, they hide their ear in the dust, in order not to be charmed, let the charmer chant however sweet and long. Men bury their conscience in the things of earth, and shut out the alluring sound of the tidings of love to

* The Targum curiously paraphrases the clause, "Who ordered the spider that wrought the web on my account at the mouth of the cave;" applying a later historical fact, which, however, might have had its *fac simile* in David's history.

Digitized by Google

the guilty. Hence, judgment comes. "Woe to thee, Chorazin." "Woe to thee, O earth, that hast heard the offers of love as well as the demands of law." In vers. 6—9 the wrath is shown under which the mighty melt away, and their glory is no more than an abortion. It is at the coming of the Son of man that it overtakes them. They are devising much and planning great schemes, but "ere their pots can feel the blazing thorn," ere their designs of ambition are reached, "he carries them away with a tempest,"—the green and the dry, the sodden and the raw (כְּמוֹ-חַי כְּמוֹ-חָרוֹן), their finished and their unfinished works and themselves, too, with all their gratified and all their as yet ungratified desires.

No doubt, at the sight of Sodom, Gomorrha, Admah, and Zeboim, destroyed, angels saw cause to rejoice and sing "Hallelujah." Wickedness was swept away; earth was lightened of a burden; justice, the justice of God, was highly exalted; love to his other creatures was displayed in freeing them from the neighbourhood of such hellish contaminations. On the same principles, and entering yet deeper into the mind of the Father, and sympathizing to the full in his justice, the Lord Jesus Himself, and each one of his members, shall cry "Hallelujah" over Antichrist's ruined hosts. (Rev. xix. 3.)

> "*The righteous shall rejoice when He seeks the vengeance,*
> *He shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked.*"—(Ver. 10.)

He shall be refreshed at the end of his journey (John xiii. 5; Luke vii. 44; Gen. xviii. 4), He shall wipe off all the dust of the way and end its weariness by entering into that strange, that divine joy over sin destroyed, justice honoured, the law magnified, vengeance taken for the insult done to Godhead, the triumph of the Holy One over the unholy. It is not merely, as an old Paraphrast gives it, as if that *were the time when* that joy begins,—

> "Then shall Messiah laugh and sing,
> Solaced for all his former toil;
> He shall the world to judgment bring,
> And all his saints shall reap the spoil."—(*Barclay.*)

It is also the occasion and cause of that day's rapturous delights.

But what follows now? It is said, ver. 11, וַיֹּאמַר אָדָם, "And *man* shall say." Is not this the effect upon the world at large in turning them to know their God, his law, his justice, his hatred of sin, his love to his own? Now shall John xvii. 23, be fulfilled. Seeing Christ and his bride, the Church, triumphant and glorified, "the world shall know that the Father sent Him, and that the Father loved them as He loved Christ." As they gaze on his and their enthroned glory, they shall confess, "*Verily there is a reward for the righteous!*" and shall bend their knee and say of Him who sitteth on the throne of his glory with his princes, who truly decree justice (Isa. xxxii. 1),

"*Verily, God judgeth the earth!*" Its government has come into

Digitized by Google

the hands of the Just One and his saints ; there is a God, there is a God who judges !

O that the sons of men would hear in this their day ! O that every ear were opened to these words of

The Righteous One, reasoning with the ungodly in prospect of the day of vengeance.

ZECHARIAH XI.

During the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, when the judgments foretold were coming in like a spring-tide over Israel, it is recorded by Jewish tradition that the great eastern-gate of the temple flew open of its own accord; upon which Rabbi Jochanan, in spite of the furious zealots round him, exclaimed, "*Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars!*" That Rabbi seems to have applied the passage to the destruction of *the temple*, understanding the "*cedars*" to be those that were used in that structure. But though this be a part of the truth, the first three verses of this chapter speak of the desolation of the *whole land*. The voice of Jehovah summons *Lebanon* (whose majestic heights, crowned with cedar, are compared to a *fortress*, as in ver. 2,) to admit the foe, the devouring fire, which consumes the cedar and the pine; and then bids *Bashan* howl; for the destruction of Lebanon, "the defenced forest" (margin), is a token of ruin to Bashan's oaks. The shepherds all over the land, on every hill and in every vale, are heard bewailing the fire that burns up the pastures; and even the lions lurking on the banks of thick-wooded *Jordan* are compelled to flee. The land is utterly spoiled! (Vers. 1—3.)

Why is this? There has been provocation given to the Lord, the nature of which he fully declares in what follows. It appears that at ver. 4, the Lord Jesus, Israel's Messiah, is introduced as speaking, telling why his land and people have been abandoned to this ruin. It is certainly Messiah that speaks, either directly, or in the person of the prophet acting as his type;—in either way, exactly parallel to the manner in which He comes into view in Isaiah viii. 11—18. The grand sin of the rejected and scattered people has been, not idolatry, as in former days, but unbelief in the Saviour presented to them. "He came to his own, and his own received him not."

"*My God saith,*" Go thou and feed that flock of mine in yonder land; a flock which may be well called "*Flock of slaughter,*" it is so exposed through the selfishness of its nominal shepherds, and "given like sheep for meat" (Psalm xliv. 11), by its share in the national chastisements—"*counted as sheep for the slaughter.*" (Rom. viii. 36.) They are under the care of shepherds who are no better than buyers and sellers, seeking only to enrich themselves (vers. 4, 5); therefore, my time of pity is ended as to the *nation*. I will give them up to civil discords and to oppressive rulers—"to *their King,*" especially that

Digitized by Google

King of whom they shall say, in their infatuated hatred of their true King coming to them in humiliation, " We have no King but *Caesar.*" Thus shall they be broken, and in vain shall they expect me to interfere when the flame has reached even their Holy of Holies. (Ver. 6.)

" *So I fed the flock.*" (Ver. 7.) These are the words of response to the command of God (ver. 6), " I fed the flock of slaughter,—poor among the sheep on account of their being thus exposed to slaughter." (This is the force of לָכֵן, translated "verily," in the margin.)

Proceeding forward to the exercise of my office, I took my rod and staff in my hand, calling the one " *Beauty,*" נֹעַם, favour, or well-pleasedness ; and the other " *Bands,*" to intimate that I was a shepherd who bound the scattered into one, who sought unity and harmony, who wished to prevent discord and civil war. (This is Christ's personal ministry in Israel.)

But I found myself called upon to act severely ; " *Three shepherds I cut off in one month.*" I disowned them, as not shepherds at all (אַכְחִד, see Isa. iii. 9 ; Job vi. 10 ; in Kal, which it might be here by the change of a single point). 1. Their *chief priests and elders* I publicly denounced as hypocrites (Matt. xxi. 23) ; and as wishing to slay the Heir of the vineyard. 2. Their *Scribes and Pharisees* I exposed as " blind guides," &c. (Matt. xxiii. 24.) 3. Their *lawyers* I declared as thoroughly corrupt and hypocritical as the others. (Luke xi. 45.) All this I did in one month, after fully investigating the state of things. *And my soul was grieved* for them (תִּקְצַר, as in Judg. x. 16) ; I wept over unhappy Jerusalem, and would fain have gathered her people under my wing ; but they would not. " *Their soul abhorred me* " (בָּחֲלָה).

What now could I do? What more could I do for my once favoured nation? I gave them up. I said (ver. 9), " I will not feed you as a nation any more. Go forth to death and rejection ;" and let the remnant in the land become the prey of civil discords.

And now I took (ver. 10) my staff " *Beauty,*" and broke it, to show the dissolving of the covenant which I had for a time made " *with the nations*" (the הָעַמִּים, not the הָעָם), forbidding them to hurt my people Israel. This covenant I now withdrew, and bade the nations take Israel as a prey. I said, that the Romans should come in, for the fence round the vineyard was gone. And the "*poor among the sheep,*" my precious ones, whom their shepherds had exposed to slaughter, knew that the Lord had spoken by me, foretelling the nation's ruin, and the temple's destruction. (See Matt. xxiv.)

But farther. The nation's rejection of me was brought very plainly to view. I brought them into circumstances which led to their telling at what price they valued me—and that price was a slave's price, thirty shekels of silver! A splendid price at which to value the Messiah! Yet this was the sum for which a Judas sold me, and at which Priests, Pharisees, and Lawyers (the three shepherds) valued me! (Ver. 12.)

Digitized by Google

To make this publicly known, the Lord bade me order matters so, that these thirty pieces should be *cast down in the Temple*, in the House of the Lord, where all would hear and notice; and then, when cast down there, these thirty pieces were to be declared *for the use of the Potter*, for some purpose connected with his establishment in the *valley of Hinnom*. (Jer. xviii. 1—3; xix. 1, 2), as if anything connected with me were fit only for that valley and its despised environs!

This being done, no wonder I cut asunder my other staff, "*Bands*," giving the people up as a prey to intestine divisions. The proverbial national feeling of Israel and Judah for each other against the Gentiles, was now to give place to bitter and bloody strifes and wars among themselves. (Ver. 14.)

And what then? The Lord bade me show that a "*Foolish Shepherd*" would arise—"a *shepherd good for nothing*" (v. 17)—a race of rulers to oppress and grind poor Israel. Romans, and Saracens, and Turks, as well as Rabbis more secretly, shall be their shepherds, since they have rejected Him who gave His life for the sheep. Yes, they shall have a shepherd (vers. 15, 16, 17), who shall not look after the lost ("cut off"), nor attend to the tender young, nor heal the broken, nor nourish those who stand still for weariness and sickness; but shall eat the flesh of the fat, and tear their claws in pieces, to make them utterly defenceless.

Nevertheless, there is a woe reserved for this shepherd—this "idol shepherd"—even when as Antichrist he seems most sure of having crushed the people for ever. The sword of the Lord shall destroy him—his shall be Jeroboam's judgment, without cure, "his arm clean dried up"—his shall be the doom of losing what he would least of all have desired to part with, the lightning of the Lord darkening his eye for ever.

Here the curtain falls. It rises again in chap. xii. 1—disclosing a new and a brighter scene in Israel's after-history. For the *covenant with Abraham* is not broken, though that *covenant with the nations* was broken for a time. (Ver. 10.) The rejected One appears again, welcomed and adored. But on that scene we do not enter.

THE DOUBLE FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY.

No. 8.—The Pentecostal Day.

Acts ii. 17—22, compared with Joel iii. 28—32.

Eighteen hundred years ago, in the city of Jerusalem, were assembled in a certain house the followers of the despised Jesus of Nazareth; they were but a little company, and had come together with one accord for prayer and supplication,—among them were the twelve apostles,—they to whom their Master, just before He ascended from them into heaven, had said, "Behold I send the promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem till ye be

Digitized by Google

endued with power from on high." Seven days had now elapsed since these words were spoken to them, they were still tarrying in Jerusalem, the day of Pentecost had fully come, and they were met together at the hour of prayer, "When suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting, and there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Tidings of this were quickly noised abroad; Jerusalem was at the time filled with Jews,—devout men, who had come there from every quarter under heaven, and they came together to the place where the apostles were, and with wondering amazement every man heard them speak in their own tongue the wonderful works of God. The devout among them said, "What meaneth this?"—the mockers, "These men are full of new wine." But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice and said, "Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words: For these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that which was spoken of by the Prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. And on my servants, and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy. And I will show wonders in the heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood and fire, and vapour of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood before that great and notable day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Such was the apostle's language, and such was his application of the words of the Prophet Joel, and not his alone, for Peter, when uttering those words, was the Spirit's mouthpiece, and when pointing out that application, the Spirit's finger-post. This prophecy of Joel's did indeed meet on that day a mighty fulfilment; three thousand souls felt the power of the Spirit; they were pricked to the heart,—a spirit of repentance, of grace, and of supplication, was poured forth upon the Church,—prophecies, tongues, the interpretation of tongues, the working of miracles, the gifts of healing, faith, the word of knowledge, and the word of wisdom: all these gifts were poured out abundantly; and the Spirit, the Comforter, who was to lead the disciples into all truth, to teach them all things, to take of the things of Christ and show them unto them, to sanctify and purify them, now indeed took up his abode with them as He had never done before. Such were the results that followed from this Pentecostal day, but, then, great and mighty as they were, they were still but the pledge of yet greater, yet mightier results that shall yet follow upon another outpouring of the Spirit, which is yet to be shed forth, of which that same prophecy in Joel testifies. If we closely examine the prophet's words we shall be constrained to see they met with but a partial accomplish-

Digitized by Google

ment in the day that Peter quoted them. On turning to its pages we find that the chapter from whence this prophecy is taken opens with the prophet sounding the trumpet note of alarm to the inhabitants of Zion, because the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. An invading army is then spoken of, and its devastating march described (ver. 3—9), signs in the sun, moon, and stars, are then told of (ver. 10, and ver. 11), the coming of the Lord is again alluded to, and from verse 12—17, the people of Zion are called upon to turn to the Lord their God, to rend their hearts and not their garments alone, to sanctify a fast, to call a solemn assembly, to supplicate the Lord their God to spare them and give them not over to the heathen to rule over them. The prayer is heard, for in the succeeding verse we read the Lord's assurance to his people that He will send them corn, wine, and oil, that He will drive away from them the northern army, whose march had been described above, and the land is called upon with the beasts of the field, not to fear nor be afraid; and the children of Zion are also called on to rejoice and be glad for the plenty, the peace, and the enduring prosperity that is to be theirs, and then follow the words, "And it shall come to pass *afterwards* that I will pour out my Spirit," &c. (Ver. 28, 29.) Once more, the prophet alludes to the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, which are to *precede* the pouring out of the Spirit, and to the deliverance that is to be vouchsafed to the dwellers in Zion and Jerusalem, who call upon the name of the Lord. From the connexion there in which this prophecy quoted by Peter stands, we learn that the Spirit of the Lord shall yet be poured forth upon the Jewish people on their return to their own land; they are first presented to us being in Jerusalem, then as being in terror from the mighty army that has come up against them; and then again filled with gladness and rejoicing at that army's destruction, at their own enduring safety, and then blessed with an abundant shedding forth of the Spirit on them from on high. So far we may gather from the chapter before us, but in the 3d chapter of the same prophet the language as to the *time* when these things shall come to pass is yet more explicit, its opening words are, "*For* in those days, and in that time *when* I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and of Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations and will bring them down to the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land." Here we have the army spoken of in chapter ii. thus linking these chapters together; then in verse 15 we have the darkening of the sun, moon, and stars, and thus another link, and then again a third link in verse 16, in the words, "The Lord also shall roar out of Zion and utter his voice from Jerusalem," which is parallel with chapter ii. 11, "The Lord shall utter his voice before his army." A fourth link too is not wanting, for the dwelling of the Lord with his people Israel is also spoken of in both chapters (compare chap. ii. 27 with iii. 17), and then again to complete one chain of evidence we have a fifth link, in the description of the prosperity and plenty with which the land shall then overflow. (See chap. ii. 24—

Digitized by Google

26, and iii. 18.) Our proofs then are many that this quotation from the Book of Joel which we meet in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, received at the time that Peter spoke but a partial fulfilment, and so may be classed with those prophecies which are capable of, and shall receive a double fulfilment. And Oh! how different will be the circumstances that shall yet attend the full completion of this prophecy, from those that attended its partial fulfilment! In the latter case the Spirit of the Lord was poured forth upon the few among the Jewish people just previously to the Lord's withdrawing Himself from them as a nation, and opening the door of salvation to the Gentiles in their stead; but from Joel we find that the Spirit of the Lord shall yet be poured upon the Jewish people on their Lord's taking them again into his favour as his chosen nation. And that Spirit shall be poured, not on a few among them only, but on them as a nation, for his promise is, "I will pour out my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." (Isa. xliv. 3.) The Lord will not again hide his face from them (see Ezek. xxxix. 29), then too will the new covenant be made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, in which is contained the promise that the Lord will put his law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts; and what is this but the covenant of the Spirit, for it is by the Spirit who is called the finger of God, Jehovah writes his law upon the hearts of the people of the house of Israel and Judah. Not many years after the Pentecostal day, Jerusalem was levelled to the ground, her people scattered among the nations; but from Joel we learn that this out-pouring of the Spirit is to take place after the same people have been brought back from this their long captivity, after which they shall never be ashamed, and this agrees too with Ezekiel xxxvi. 24—27. But then if there will be such a difference in the circumstances attending the first and second fulfilment of this prophecy, we are able to trace an analogy between some of the results that followed from this Pentecostal day, and those that will yet follow on the future out-pouring of the Spirit. *Then* was there a fulfilment of the words, "I will pour out my Spirit upon *all flesh*," for from henceforth the Gentiles were to be made fellow-heirs with the Jews, looked upon as of the same body, and as partakers of the promises in Christ by the Gospel; and so in the tenth chapter of the Acts we read, that "upon the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost;" and thus will it be in time to come, for on the future restoration of Israel and Judah, on the Spirit's being shed abroad on them, the result will be that it will also be poured on all flesh, for then will be the fulness of the Gentiles, then will the heathen become the Lord's inheritance, then will nations be spiritually born in a day. Since the day of Pentecost there have been droppings, as it were, on the remnant, according to the election of grace, taken from among Jew and Gentile, of the heavenly rain which descended from heaven to earth; *then* was the time of "the former rain," but at the full completion of Joel's prophecy, there will be a co-mingling together, if I may so speak, of the former and latter rain, and during the millennial dispensation there will not alone be droppings, but showers

Digitized by Google

of blessing. And then, too, will the like gifts that were poured forth upon the Church in the Apostolic age be again shed abroad upon Jew and Gentile, the gifts at least of prophesyings, teachings, wonderful visions, and remarkable dreams; and here, I would observe, that it seems to me that *all* the miraculous gifts possessed by the early Church will not again be restored, the gift of tongues was one, the chief one given on the day of Pentecost; but as Paul tells us that tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not, and as the knowledge of the Lord shall, in the millennial age, cover the earth, even as the waters cover the sea, then may we suppose that the gift of tongues will not be of the number; besides, too, the diversity of language which the gift of tongues was to meet will not, as I think we have reason to believe, exist in the age to come, for thus saith the Lord by the Prophet Zephaniah, "Then will I turn to the people a pure language, or lip, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord to serve Him with one consent;" but be this as it may, or in whatsoever manner the gifts of the Spirit may be again given, yet we know that as on the day of Pentecost a spirit of humiliation and repentance, of grace and of supplication, will be poured forth upon the Jewish people (see Eph. xxxvi. 31; Jer. xxxi. 18, 19, and 9; Zech. xii. 10) not, as I before said, upon a Jew among them, but on the whole house of Israel and Judah; and a spirit of holiness also, for it is written, "My people shall be all holy"—then, indeed, will every Jewish heart be circumcised and become the dwelling-place of the Lord the Spirit, so that of that people it shall then be said by the Lord God Almighty, "Ye are my sons and daughters"—and then, too, will all the nations of the earth be converted to the Lord by the shedding forth of the Spirit, so that all "the people" shall do willing service to the Lord Jehovah, and render homage to Jesus the King of the whole earth, who shall then rule victorious as the Son of David and as the Son of Man.

THE MORE EXCELLENT NAME.

(*Continued from* page 306.)

Let us now inquire what *claims this name has upon us?* or what influence should the testimony of God, concerning the name of his Son, have upon our thoughts, feelings, words, and actions? Here again the sacred Scriptures will be our guide, and that same book which has unfolded to us the glories of the name of Jesus, will instruct us *how* to act toward it. We may also learn much from the conduct of those who have been made happy and victorious through that name.

We should *think* upon his name. We should think much, and think deeply, and seek grace from God to think profitably. There is "a book of remembrance written for them that fear the Lord, and that think upon his name." (Mal. iii. 17.) Jehovah looks with delight upon that soul who has many trustful loving thoughts on Christ. Such

Digitized by Google

another intensely interesting field of thought cannot be found in the universe of God, and it is as profitable as it is pleasant. Let us then ponder his question who wears this name, "*What think ye of Christ?*" It is essentially necessary to our salvation that we think *with God* concerning him; and the more this is the case, the more communion will there be enjoyed, and the more conformity will there be possessed. "Think much of God (says one), and He will be consciously present with you." We may also say, think much of Christ, and He will be graciously present with you.

The name of Jesus claims our *faith and trust*. "These are written that ye might *believe*, ... and have life through his name." (John xx. 31.) "In his name shall the Gentiles *trust*." (Matt. xii. 21.) They shall trust Him *for* all, and trust Him *with* all; and those who do so shall have to say, "I know whom I have trusted, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that I have committed to Him against that day." (2 Tim. i. 12.) Believer, you have many wants; the name of Jesus trusted in will prove to you a well of salvation and blessing. You have many foes; his name will be an invulnerable shield, and a conquering sword—you have many fears; his name contains all the promises, and all his loving titles and tender relations are suited to comfort and cheer you. Only trust Him. Faith in his name secures you an interest in all that name contains. That name is God's great gift for you to use. It is an all-suited object of faith, provided by infinite wisdom and love. The air is not so suited for your lungs, or light for your eyes, or food for your appetite, as Jesus is for your faith. The plenitude of light, the freeness of the air, and the boundlessness of the provisions of Providence, are only figures to set forth the infinite fulness, fitness, and freeness of the name of Jesus. You never ask, May I breathe the air? You *must* do so in order to live. You do not scruple to make use of God's light, and you are as much at liberty to make use of Christ for salvation, as to breathe, to look, or to eat. The only way in which you can possibly glorify God is by acting faith on the name of Jesus. God shuts you up to this; let us not by unbelief shut ourselves out from this high privilege.

Bless that name which is to you such a fountain of blessing. *Blessing is the language of affection.* It is the heart's utterance of its fulness of delight and desire. The mother, as she clasps her dear little one to her breast, exclaims, "Bless the child." And the believer, while embracing the name of Jesus, exclaims, "Blessed be his glorious name for ever, and let the whole earth be filled with his glory." (Ps. lxxii. 19.) When God blesses his people, he confers his favours on them—when they bless Him, they thank Him for those favours, speak well of Him for what He has done, and wish well to his cause and glory. And should not every believer speak well of the name of Jesus, and that out of the abundance of his heart, and because he thinks well and highly of Him? And should he not bless God for such an unspeakable gift, "and evermore be giving thanks to God and the Father through Him?"

It should be pleaded in prayer, as well as presented before God in

Digitized by Google

praise. It was provided for this special purpose. Jesus said, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything *in my name*, I will do it." (John xiv. 13, 14.) We should ever go to the throne with a sense of our own unworthiness, constantly bearing in mind that as our acceptance is only "*in* the Beloved," so our access can only be *through* Him. We must plead his merit as the ground of our hope of blessing, we must plead his word as an argument with God, and ever have as our great end his glory in view. Thus we are taught our constant dependance, and learn his acceptableness to the Father.

We should labour to *spread* his name among men. God hath said that it "shall be perpetuated," and He carries out his purposes by human agency. It becomes all who love this glorious name to cherish the noble resolution of the Psalmist, "I will make thy name to be remembered to all generations; therefore shall the people praise thee for ever and ever." (Ps. xlv. 17.) This was the theme of the first witnesses for Jesus. Peter boldly declared there was no other. Philip preached the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus (Acts viii. 12), with much success. Paul was a chosen vessel "to bear the name of Jesus" (Acts ix. 31), and of him and Barnabas it is testified that they were "men who had hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xv. 26.) It was dearer to them than life itself. Having ventured their souls *upon* it, they ventured their lives *for* it; and we shall never do the latter, without we do the former. Through the help of God, there have not been wanting men in all ages who have "rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name." (Acts v. 41.)

These holy men constantly realized the scene on Olivet when the Saviour gave them his last commands and his parting promise. Preach, he says, "repentance and remission of sins *in my name*, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke xxiv. 47.) They waited for "the Comforter whom the Father should send in his name." (John xiv. 26.) And when they were "endued with power from on high," his name became henceforth their constant theme. They felt that it contained all that they needed, and all that the worst sinners on earth required. By it they conquered hearts, healed diseases, and overcame death. Did their foes despise that glorious name, and ask, Where is he whom you preach? they testified to his glory in heaven, and proved the truth of their testimony by the wonders which they wrought in his name on earth. It was in their hands a conquering sword and an invulnerable shield. In it they gloried with holy triumph; to it they submitted with childlike obedience; and while thus acting, power, purity, and unity characterized the Church, and victory attended her path.

We should *make use of that name* in *duty*, and bring it into constant requisition. It is suited for every grace of the Spirit to act upon. We must not only pray and praise in his name (Heb. xiii. 15), but "whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father through him." (Coloss. iii. 17.)

Digitized by Google

If a cup of cold water be given, let it be given in his name. (Mark ix. 41.) We are nothing apart from it, and can do nothing without it. On it, therefore, let us rest; attempt all things required in it; and expect all promised blessings through it. His name will strengthen for duty and stimulate to diligence. Here love may find a perfect object of affection, joy an overflowing fountain, and hope infinite and eternal blessedness. Here is a perfect pattern, and a plenitude of power. In that name, then, let each saint abide, and in it let the Church of God meet. Here is our meeting-place with God; and here is our meeting-place with each other. Of him the whole family in heaven and earth, is named (Eph. iii. 15), and into him all shall at last be gathered. But until this great gathering takes place, how sweet are his words, "where two or three are gathered together *in my name*, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. xviii. 20.) In his name alone all true saints are united. About many other things they differ, but all agree that he is worthy; and that his name is glorious. To his merit, his authority, his glory, let them have supreme respect in all their gatherings for worship and service. Many gather together *against* his name, some *without* it, some *around* it, and *near* it; but real worshippers gather together *in it.* This is true wisdom, and real happiness. Such are safe, and shall succeed. Abiding in him, even in his blessed name, they will be preserved from will-worship, and from resting on empty forms, and shall realize fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ, and also with each other in the Father and the Son. Let it never be forgotten that a personal connexion *with* that name must precede social fellowship *in* it. We must know God in Christ as a reconciled and loving Father, and then we shall meet the saints as our brethren in Jesus.

We should hope and long to see the name of Jesus fully unfolded. We should mourn over the reproaches heaped upon it, and earnestly desire to see it beam bright with glory. And soon this shall be the case. What a scene of wonder shall, ere long, burst upon the view of the dwellers on earth. "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns, and *he had a name written,* that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, *and his name is called* THE WORD OF GOD." (Rev. xix. 11—13.) As the WORD he will reveal himself, and make known his Father; for that day will be the day of *his* manifestation, and of the revelation of GOD. Then shall every tongue confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father, and "in the world to come" he shall be exalted "in power, might, and dominion, far above every name that is named." (Ephes. i. 20.) Then he, "who was made a little while lower than the angels, and who is now crowned with glory and honour," shall bring out the full and blessed meaning of that title, "*the second Adam.*" Seated on "his own throne," the visible vicegerent of the invisible Father; his enemies made his footstool; Satan cast out; death swallowed up in victory; "all the

Digitized by Google

angels of God shall worship him," and unite with the countless tribes of ransomed men in singing, "O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth, who hast set thy glory above the heavens." Then will the enemy and avenger be stilled, and "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings God will ordain strength;" man will be a humble adorer, living in the smile of God; and "the creature be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." (Rom. viii. 24.) He who stooped so low and rose so high, will, with the many sons brought to glory, as children of the resurrection, made like unto the angels, reign over this recovered and renovated world; and then, "according to his name, will be his praise unto the ends of the earth." Contemplating this glorious consummation,—this restitution of all things,—this new-founding of the earth by the hands of mercy on the rock of redemption, this sweet psalm we have quoted concludes as it commenced, "O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is THY NAME in all the earth." And is such the destiny of this now groaning world? Shall this earth yet shine with *his* glory who bathed it with his tears and blood? Even so, Lord Jesus, it must be, and thou art worthy thus to suffer and triumph! Looking for this glorious period, should not every redeemed heart sigh out, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly?" "In the way of thy judgments, O Lord, we have waited for thee; the desire of our soul is to thy name, and to the remembrance of thee." (Isa. xxvi. 8.) Jesus will answer the cry of his Church, and fulfil the desire of his saints. He will come "to cast down the mighty from their seats, and to exalt them of low degree." All the mighty names of men shall shrink into nothing, and they who wore them shall grow pale with terror, when He "who hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords," shall appear to claim his right, and end their usurpation. Then will he be "the desire of all nations;" and under his peaceful sway true liberty shall be realized, the reign of order and happiness restored, and men shall at length learn *that all real happiness is an emanation from his name*, and can only be realized by those who depend upon its merit, and submit to its authority. Well might the dying psalmist, the sweet singer of Israel, strike his loudest, sweetest notes, as the glories of that day beamed upon him from afar. He saw the excellent name of Jesus fully expanded, and his soul basked rejoicingly in its rays, and sweetly sung, "Blessed be his glorious name for ever, and let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen, and Amen."

In conclusion, dear reader, see to it that your connexion with the name of Christ be not external and superficial; but *internal* and *saving*. Many will fail here. "Many" (says Jesus) "will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied *in thy name?* and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name have done many wonderful works?" (Matt. vii.) All this may be true, and yet He may have to say to such, "*I never knew you.*" I never knew you as needy applicants for salvation in my name,—as building all your hopes upon it, and seeking your happiness from it. Let us not be satisfied with a

Digitized by Google

name to live, but realize life by trusting in a living name. The name of Jesus is the representative of everything saving, blessed, and desirable ; real religion is to treat it as such. Those who treat the Saviour as a name, without any reality behind it, will be satisfied "with a name to live." Religion is a personal affair, and not a mere speculation. It reveals a personal Deity in the face or character of Jesus, and draws the soul on to real personal contact and communion with him.

Let all who wear this name *walk in it* (Micah iv. 5 ; Col. ii. 6), and thus recommend and adorn it. Thus reads the inscription on God's seal: "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from all iniquity." (2 Tim. ii. 19.) Thus will honour be brought to the name of Jesus, while an opposite line of conduct will cause that worthy name to be evil spoken of. As you have subscribed with your hand to the Lord, and surnamed yourself by the name of Israel (Isa. xliv. 5), seek to walk by that rule which will ensure the flowings down of mercy and peace. (Gal. vi. 16.)

Stand up for the honours of this name, against usurpers, and all Antichrists, who would rob Christ of his glory, or depose him from his authority. Seek grace to maintain your allegiance inviolate. The words of Paul to the Corinthians are worthy of remark: "Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" (1 Cor. i. 13.) If the world gains the ascendancy in the affections, or creature love entices the heart from Jesus, or other names allure from him, let us propose this question, and remember that we have sworn allegiance to the name of Jesus.

Should this meet the eye of an enemy of the cross of Christ, let the words of one who was once in this sad condition appeal to that enemy: "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." (Acts xxvi. 9.) He acted upon his thoughts, until the fearful discovery burst upon him that he was "kicking against the pricks," yea, "striving with his Maker." He surrendered to the majesty of the name which he had long defied. That name saved him, blessed him, and employed him. In it he found an ocean of merit which hid for ever all his sins from view, a fountain of blessedness to enrich his soul, and an universe of wonders to employ his intellect and tongue, in thought, testimony, and thanksgiving. Let all who have shared his blessedness imitate his zeal, and spend and be spent to spread the name of Jesus.

We close these imperfect meditations upon this perfect subject with the earnest prayer of this trophy of the name of Jesus: "Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power: that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you, and ye in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Thess. i. 11, 12.)

Digitized by Google

EMPHATIC USE OF PRONOUNS IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

We give the following as instances where the Pronoun is in the original employed with the view of giving emphasis to the thing stated, or in order to put emphasis on some one clause of the statement:—

Rev. ii. 23.—"*All the churches shall know that* I (ὅτι ἐγω) *am He who searcheth.*" I who am Redeemer, I who gave myself for you, am the very person who tries the reins.

Rev. iii. 9.—"*And shall know that* I (ὅτι ἐγω) *have loved thee.*" However many were thine adversaries, however much the world hateth thee, yet *I* loved thee.

Rev. xxi. 6.—"*I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end;* I will give to him that is athirst" (ἐγω δωσω). I, who am all in all, will with mine own hand bestow this free gift.

Rev. ii. 15.—"*So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes.*" The words, "thou also," are, "εχεις και συ;" even thou who didst hold fast the faith in the days of Antipas.

Rev. iii. 17.—"*And knowest not that* THOU *art* (ὅτι συ ἐι) *wretched and miserable.*" Thou who so pridest thyself in thy riches, yes, even thou art wretched!

Rev. iv. 11.—"*For* THOU (συ) *hast created all.*" Thou, Lord, and none else.

Rev. xii. 11.—"*And* THEY *overcame* (αὐτοι ενικησαν);" the angels sing this,—in their song which they sing of the Redeemed whom the devils accused, "THEY overcame him by the blood of the Lamb." As for us angels, we needed not *the blood;* but they, sinners, used it, and prevailed in spite of all accusation.

Rev. xix. 15.—"*And* HE *shall rule them* (αὐτος ποιμανει) *with a rod of iron, and He* (αὐτος πατει) *treadeth the winepress.*" It is He and no other that uses the rod of iron. It is He and no other who presses the grapes, and sprinkles the life-blood of his enemies.

The above instances are like similar cases in the Old Testament Hebrew. Thus, Ezekiel xxxvii. 3: "*O Lord God,* THOU (אַתָּה) *knowest.*" The pronoun is emphatic; "*Thou,* and only thou, canst tell." In ver. 5, also, "*Behold,* I (אֲנִי) *will cause breath to enter into you.*" Though you cannot, and though they cannot do it to themselves, yet I can and I will. It is thus, in like manner, in Psalm li. 3: "*For* I (אֲנִי) *acknowledge my transgression.*" I, the very person, who have sinned so boldly, and who was so hardened for a whole year, I now come confessing.

Perhaps these examples may induce our readers to examine for themselves other similar passages, those readers, at least, who understand the original.

Digitized by Google

Reviews.

New View of the Apocalypse; or, the Plagues of Egypt and of Europe identical, &c. By C. E. Fraser Tytler. Part I. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. 1852.

Certainly the spirit of this work is excellent. It is truth that the author is seeking,—the truth of God. It is to know the mind of the Spirit that he is searching the Scriptures. In so doing he sets before us much that we can accord with and commend,—much with which we may be truly profited. Whether, therefore, the reader may receive or reject his view of the Apocalypse, he will not find that he has spent his time idly or vainly in the perusal of this pamphlet.

After full consideration, we must declare ourselves *not* prepared to acquiesce in Mr. Tytler's system. The substance of it he thus states: "*The prophets commonly see a vista of types and antitypes, from the primary and immediate one to the remote and ultimate one, like glasses on a telescope mutually aiding and bearing out each other, and though distinct, apart and separate, appearing like one and the same.*" (P. 13.) This idea is not a new one, it is only new as applied to the Apocalypse, if, indeed, it be not the same as Hengstenberg's. It is *in substance* what is usually called "double prophecy;" only in Mr. Tytler's view it would not be "double" merely, but a "hundred-fold." That there are specimens of this in Scripture, we admit to a certain extent. Babylon is an instance. The "wicked one" of the Psalms is another. The "Assyrian" of Isaiah is another. But while in certain specific cases of *unchronological* prophecy we allow that the principle is to be found; we refuse to go beyond these, and to admit its application to other instances of fixed, definite, and chronological prophecy, such as Daniel and the Apocalypse. We apprehend danger from such an extension of the principle, which, within a very limited range, we concede, is assumed in some Old Testament predictions. But act upon it universally, and what becomes of Daniel's four empires? What become of the seventy weeks? Chronological prophecy must have one definite fulfilment, and any system that would interfere with its dates and persons, or relax this definiteness which attaches to it, we cannot subscribe to.

A Word in Season, for a Warning to England; or, a Prophecy of Perilous Times, Opened and Applied. By Thomas Willes, M.A., Minister of the Gospel in the City of London. 1659.

Though this is not a millenarian book, it is a very solemn and useful one, fixing our eye not merely upon the evils of the day, but directing it to the Lord's coming. "O with what pantings, what thirstings, what longings, should your hearts be drawn forth, in these perilous times, after this appearing of Christ, after these anticipations of glory."

Digitized by Google

(P. 401.) After telling us that "the last days are the worst days," he adds: "Thus we see how the last days respect the whole time of the Gospel Church, from the apostles' times to the end of the world. This is the evening of the world, as the time before us was the morning. The nearer night the greater darkness, till the glory of the Lord, with lightning, shall break out of the clouds." (P. 11.)

The Examination of the Sign χξσ (*Rev.* xiii. 18). By M. CELY TREVILIAN, Esq. Bath: Binns and Goodwin.

THOUGH the author has written ably and well, he has not proved his point to our satisfaction. We cannot adopt his theory in any of its parts or aspects. The marvellous number still remains a marvel; but God, in his own time, will decipher it for us.

The Jansenists; their Rise, Persecutions by the Jesuits, and existing Remnant: a Chapter in Church History. By S. P. TREGELLES, LL.D. London: Bagster and Sons. 1851.

MANY years ago, the "Memoirs of Port Royal" had introduced us to the Jansenists, and interested us in their romantic history. But this admirable little work of Dr. Tregelles carries their story farther down, —to our own day. We used to think of them as an extinct band of martyrs, we now see them as a still-existing body of confessors. In addition to the doctrines of grace, which they are known to have held, we find them receiving pre-millennial truth. The statement of the Archbishop of Utrecht to Dr. Tregelles regarding their prophetic beliefs was as follows: "The Lord Jesus shall be glorified on this earth, where he once suffered. He is to reign, as it was promised, on the throne of his father David. When he comes, some will rise; there will be a resurrection of his people, his faithful ones; for they shall all reign with Him. The Jews will be his people on earth, when their sins are taken away; but the resurrection of all, and the end of all things, will not be till after his reign." (P. 94.)

Is it not singular that while Popery has condemned millenarianism as heresy, and set its official brand upon it in its various recognised systems of theology, these faithful witnesses for the grace of God, within its pale, should have been led to its reception? Thus, while Popery and Jesuitism combine in their hatred and rejection of these great prophetic truths, Jansenism upholds them! The only section of the Papacy that cleaves to the doctrines of grace, receives pre-millennialism! Could anything more strongly show, how, from the days of Jerome downward, Popery and post-millennialism have gone hand in hand together?

The Foreign Evangelical Review. No. II. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter.

THIS second number is quite equal to the first. Both are admirable.

Digitized by Google

Pastoral Theology, the Theory of a Gospel Ministry. By A. VINET. Translated from the French. Edinburgh: T. and F. Clark. 1852.

NOT having had time to examine this minutely, we cannot speak definitely as to its merits ; but, like all Vinet's works, it seems to be original, eloquent, and profitable.

The Revelation of St. John. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG. Vol. II. Edinburgh : T. and F. Clark. 1852.

WITH very much of this volume we cannot agree, yet it contains some useful elucidations of the book it undertakes to expound. We do not undervalue Hengstenberg's merits, but we fear he has failed in interpreting the Apocalypse.

Notes and Reflections on the Psalms. By ARTHUR PRIDHAM. Bath : Binns and Goodwin. 1852.

THE spirit of this work is excellent, and its tone high. With much that is in it we accord. But we dissent from a good deal. What we felt most dissatisfied with was the *mysticism* which we find in many of its pages. We profess ourselves unable to understand many of its sentences. It is not, however, so bad as Mr. Darby's "Lectures on the Seven Apocalyptic Epistles," recently published, where the supplanting of the light of Scripture by the darkness of man's irreverent crudities is painful in the extreme. Surely to write plainly ought to be the aim of every commentator. These "Notes on the Psalms" are much inferior to the "Notes on the Romans."

The Separate State of the Spirits of the Righteous between Death and Resurrection. By G. J. WALKER. London: J. K. Campbell.

A WELL-WRITTEN statement of Scripture truth upon this important subject.

England's Church and England's Hopes Spiritually Considered, &c. By Mrs. ANNE HEASELL. London. 1852.

WITH much that is truly good there are some things in this work with which we cannot wholly agree.

Hymns for the Church of God. London: Houlston and Stoneman. 1852.

A COLLECTION of excellent hymns, from various quarters. Other hymn-books also have fallen into our hands, of which we cannot speak particularly; and instead of quoting from any of them, we prefer giving a stirring hymn, lately sent us by a Correspondent. We cannot in general find room for poetical contributions, and therefore we have had

Digitized by Google

to decline receiving them, but we do not think our readers will blame us for finding room for this. Its title is—

WARNING AND ANTICIPATION.

DREAM not of a fairer earth
Ere the King of kings shall come,
Till creation's second birth
Guilt shall swell its awful sum.
Ne'er a brighter sun shall rise
Till Christ shall greet our waiting eyes,
Earth shall wear no richer green
Till Christ upon the Mount is seen.

Deeper still on land and sea
Gather shall the night of sorrow,
Few shall Zion's watchers be
At the dawning of the morrow.
Far resoundeth o'er the flood
The roar of Satan's multitude,
Hear the rushing of his wing,
See its sable shadowing.

Christian, ere the clash of war,
Gird your armour, take your post;
See, by faith, the guiding-star,
See your angel-guarding-host.
High the Gospel-banner wave,
Hear your mission, "Seek and save;"
Hear your marching orders,* "Call
Jew and Gentile,—summon all."

Fear ye not the storm and flood,
Cheer with loving words each other.
Satan's snares resist to blood;
Lean upon your Elder Brother.
Ere shall burst the bolt of wrath,
Bright with blessings make your path;
Bear to every clime and nation
Tidings of the great salvation.
When the world hath heard the sound,
Through the night will flash the ray,—
From Bether's hills our King shall bound,
And bring the everlasting day.

* It is reported that the Duke of Wellington said to a clergyman, who spoke to him about the futility of a Mission to the Hindoos, "Look at your marching orders, Sir,—' Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.' "

Digitized by Google

Extracts.

Resurrection of the Just.

THE mention of the ἀνάστασις τῶν δικαίων, without any occasion to call it forth, is an evident indication that the distinction made by the Jews between the first and second resurrection was acknowledged by our Lord as correct. Such passages as Rev. xx. 5 (where the expression ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη occurs); 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23; 1 Thess. iv. 16, show also that the apostles themselves had embraced this distinction within the circle of their ideas. In the Book of Revelation the whole conclusion of the work would be entirely unintelligible without it. The rationalistic expositors were unprejudiced enough to acknowledge that this doctrine was supported by the New Testament, but they employed it in proof of their view that the apostles (and in part the Saviour himself) were entangled in Jewish prejudice, or that they accommodated themselves to such errors. (As to the opinion of the Jews, compare Bertholdt in the Christ. Jud. § 35, p. 176, seqq.) We shall afterwards take pains to show (in a preliminary way, indeed, on Matthew xxiv.), that the distinction drawn between the two resurrections stands in closest union with the whole circle of doctrines as to the final issue of all things, and that only when we adopt it, do many passages of Scripture acquire their true meaning.

As to the distinction also between the ἀνάστασις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, and ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, compare the observations on Matt. xxii. 31.—*Olshausen on the Gospels*, p. 27.

Kingdom of God.

HENCE the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ here is, as the context shows, that state in which the will of God shall have dominion on earth,—the restoration of earth to its original condition. In this state did the Jews hope to live in peace under the sway of Messiah, along with the risen saints of the Old Testament, whose representatives, the progenitors of their race, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are mentioned by name. (Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 28.) The joyful hope of Messiah's speedy appearance was usually associated with the blessed anticipation of life in the Messianic kingdom. In substance, this series of ideas was entirely correct, and corresponded as well with the predictions of the Old Testament as with the representations of the New; only the Jews in general formed grossly material conceptions of the Messiah's kingdom, and forgot the internal conditions which required to be fulfilled in order to their being admitted into it. As members of the nation of God, they believed that they must, in any event, be incorporated into God's kingdom."—*Ibid.*, p. 28.

"UNFEIGNEDLY thirst for the coming of the Lord Jesus."—*Knox.*

Digitized by Google

A Student of Prophecy in the Olden Time.

"ALTHOUGH I have but of late attempted to write this so high a work, for preventing the apparent danger of Papistry arising within this island; yet, in truth, it is no few years since first I began to precogitate the same. For, in my tender years and barneage at St. Androes, at the schools, having, on the one part, contracted a loving familiarity with a certain gentleman, a Papist; and, on the other part, being attentive to the sermons of that worthy man of God, Master Christopher Goodman, teaching upon the Apocalypse; I was so moved in admiration against the blindnesse of Papists, that could not most evidently see their seven-hilled city, Rome, painted out there so lively by Saint John, as the mother of all spiritual whoredom, that not onely burst I out in continuall reasoning against my said familiar, but also from thenceforth I determined with myself (by the assistance of God's Spirit) to employ my study and diligence to search out the remanent mysteries of that holy book, as to this hour (praised be the Lord) I have been doing, at all such times as I might have occasion. But (to confesse the truth of the infirmity of man, to the glory of God) I found ever, during all that time, more fruit in one hour's sobriety, prayer, and humble meditation, than in a thousand days of curious or presumptuous inquisition: yea, the more subtilly I searched, the more darknesse I found; insomuch as curious inquisition rather discouraged me by finding out of doubts, than profited me by finding any resolution thereof."—*Napier, Lord Merchiston, on the Apocalypse, the Epistle to the Godly and Christian Reader. Ed.* 1645.

Persecution till the Lord come.

PEDEN, in 1682, preaching on Psalm cxxix. 3, said, "Would you know who first yoked this plough? It was cursed Cain, when he drew his furrows so long and deep, that he let out the life-blood of his brother Abel. And this cursed seed has and will design, desire, and endeavour to follow his cursed example, and that plough will gang (go) summer and winter, frost and fresh weather, till the world's end, and at the sound of the last trumpet, the ploughmen will lose their grips of the plough, and the gadmen throw away their gads."

Surely, I come quickly.

"THE Church gives a hearty echo to Christ's promise; *Amen, even so come, Lord Jesus.* Thus beats the pulse of the Church, thus breathes that gracious Spirit which actuates and informs the mystical body of Christ; and we should never be satisfied till we find such a spirit breathing in us, and causing us to look for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of Jesus Christ."—*Matthew Henry.*

"THE last trumpet is blowing within the realm of England, and

Digitized by Google

therefore ought every man to prepare him for the battle; for if the trumpet should cease and be put to silence, then it shall never blow again with like force in England, till the coming of the Lord Jesus." —*Knox*, A.D. 1554.

"The relation between Christ and his contracted spouse, enforceth a desire of his coming. It is the time of the Church's contract; she is a Bride now; she is contracted. Now, all the time between the contract and the marriage is a time of longing and desire, therefore, the Church cannot but desire the second coming of Christ. It is the nature of imperfection, when there is truth in imperfection, to desire perfection. You see the little seed that is sown in the ground, it breaks through the thick clods, because it is not in its perfection till it be in the ear; nature hath given it an instinct to break out. So where the seed of grace is, it will break out and shoot forward, to desire still and still, till it comes to perfection. Grace being an imperfect state here, it puts forward in desiring that perfection which it cannot attain in this world, but in the world to come. Therefore, the Spirit and the Bride say, Come."—*Sibbs.**

"Our heavenly Father, of his infinite wisdom, to hold us in continual remembrance, that in this wretched world there is no rest, suffereth us to be tried with this cross, that with an unfeigned heart we may desire, not only an end of our own troubles (for that shall come to us by death), but also of all the troubles of the Church of God, which shall not be before the again-coming of the Lord Jesus."—*Knox*, A.D. 1554.

"Consider by the signs forespoken by our Master Christ Jesus, which for the most part are now present, the days of this most corrupt world to be short, and therefore the joyful deliverance of the oppressed and afflicted flock to approach."—*Ibid.*

"The marks and signs of Christ's second advent are fulfilling daily. His coming cannot be far off. If you compare the uncommon events which the Lord said were to be the forerunners of his coming to judgment, with what hath lately happened in the world, you must conclude that the time is at hand."—*Romaine.*

"The day of the Lord is at hand, when all men shall appear as they are: there shall be no borrowed colours in that day; men borrow the lustre of Christianity, but how many counterfeit masks will be burned in the day of God!"—*Rutherford.*

* Sibbs throughout this discourse (on Rev. xxii. 17), takes for granted that the first part this verse is a prayer for the coming of the Lord.

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

ANSWER TO THE "REPLY" TO STRICTURES OF "A CHRISTIAN GEOLOGIST" UPON "THE PROBABLE CREATION PLACE OF ANGELS."

To the Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

Dear Sir,—What led me to say that the remarks in reference to geology, contained in the paper on "The Probable Creation Place of Angels," which appeared in your number for January last, were, in my opinion, highly objectionable, was this:—they seem to place science, legitimate science, and Divine revelation in direct collision. The writer of those remarks tells me, in his Reply, that such is not the case—that I have misunderstood him—that he did not allude to Christian, but to Infidel geologists, and that this sufficiently appears from the context to the words objected to by me. I have read his paper over again, and I confess I am unable to take a different view of it to that which I took at first. He speaks (p. 110) of "*the geologist*," as such, without a word as to whether he supposes him to be a Christian or an Infidel. Doubtless he was thinking of the latter, from what he has since told us; but surely there is nothing in his first paper to indicate this: on the contrary, though, it is true, mention is made (p. 108) of the arguments which have been raised against the truth of the Mosaic history of creation, and, by consequence of Divine revelation, from the discoveries of modern geologists; yet the discoveries of the geologist are so identified with their abuse by the Infidel, that the former has to bear all the blame.

The two passages which I ventured to object to were the following:—"That, moreover, as in one class of such fossil remains there are no remains of man to be found, the principle, so commonly received by Christians, that *as by sin came death into the world*, is at once disproved, inasmuch as, long before the creation of man upon the earth, death had reigned, and that to a vast extent." (P. 108.) "Does the geologist tell us of the result of his researches, and drawing out from the recesses of our earth the relics of an earlier world, does he point to those in which no fossil remnant of human kind is discoverable; and then, with an air of triumph, pronounce, that our doctrine is naught?" (P. 110.) To this I replied (p. 215), "The geologist does nothing of the kind;" he neither denounces "the doctrine," nor "the principle,"—or should any one aspiring to the title be so rash as to do so, be it remembered that he finds no support for his rashness in the science itself. But the case stands really thus:—Between geology and Scripture there is not the slightest disagreement in reference to the doctrine in question: but between geology and the views of that doctrine held by some believers in Scripture there is the most fatal and irreconcileable difference. What the Scriptures say is this—"Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all MEN, for that all have sinned." (Rom. v. 12.) Here, be it observed, all that is affirmed is this—by sin came the death of *man;* and to this statement *geology makes not the slightest objection.* But some Christians are not satisfied to stop here, but they must, forsooth, make this *addition* to the record —*by sin came also the death of the lower animals. Now*, however, geology interferes, &c. If you, Mr. Editor, will kindly allow these extracts to be reprinted, they will serve to bring the whole question in dispute fairly before your readers; and I confess, I am anxious this should be done, because I feel that the question is one that is of vast importance, in the present day, in its bearing on the Word of God.

In the Reply to my remarks it is said (p. 318), that if Rom. v. 12 were the only Scripture that spoke upon the subject, my argument might be justified;

Digitized by Google

but that "when we turn to Rom. viii. 19—23, the case is changed." We shall see.

The opinion of Scott upon the passage is quoted to the effect that, "the animal tribes are subject to pain and *death* through man's sin." No man has a higher opinion of this venerable commentator's judgment than I have, but it must be remarked, that he does not support his statement in the present case with the slightest proof, and hence that it cannot be received as anything more than his individual opinion.

But it is said—"he was borne out by the Sacred text." *Where?* and *how?* It tells us that "the whole creation was made subject to vanity;" but where does it tell us that it was "*through the sin of man?*" There is not a single word to this effect. It is a pure assumption—just one of those "*additions*" to the Word of God of which I complained in my former paper. But neither, it is true, does the Sacred text say, that the groaning of the visible creation, and its subjection to vanity, were *not* through the sin of man; it announces, or recognises the fact, but it leaves the cause of it undisclosed; and hence, as may be urged in apology for Scott and others who wrote in former days,—when geology did not exist as a science, though *physiology* did, and its disclosures ought to have been listened to more than they were,—it is no great marvel that they should have filled up the blank of Scripture by saying, "*And all through the sin of man!*" In doing this, however, they afforded another proof, in addition to the thousands existing before, that it is dangerous to attempt, even in the slightest degree, "to be wise above that which is written." A new science has since arisen, which has made us acquainted with facts that were not so much as "dreamt of in our philosophy." It has told us of other worlds than that which now exists,—of other systems, of plants and animals as having prevailed successively on this globe, and that for unnumbered ages prior to the time of man; moreover, that among them, and over them, death reigned as at present, and that during the whole of those vast periods, yea, and even from their commencement, "*the whole creation has groaned and travailed in pain together until now.*" It pretends not to have discovered the cause of this,—of this it knows nothing; but it testifies with certainty to the fact, that the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms were subject to the same disturbing forces as at present; that for ages prior to the time of man the storm and the tempest raged as now above, and the volcano beneath the earth, and that the plant withered and died, and the animal writhed in agony and perished! In a word, geology assures us that a state of things, in reference to the visible creation, which we had somewhat hastily supposed had been induced by the sin of man, existed for millions of years before he was called into being. Learning this, we go back to the Divine record, and we now find that we had made that say what in reality it does not say. *We* have affirmed that the whole creation was made subject to vanity "*through man's sin;*" but, on reconsulting the record we discover that it says nothing of the kind, and hence that we alone are accountable for such a statement.

It matters comparatively little to the question in dispute, but I am persuaded—and here I agree with Scott—that πασα κτισις means the entire visible creation, the inanimate as well as the animate world. I need not go into the grounds upon which I found this opinion, but I may remark, that it is no proof against its correctness that the *in*animate creation cannot suffer "pain," for neither can the animate "wait" with "earnest expectation," as an intelligent being, "for the manifestation of the sons of God." But we know that *promises of deliverance* are made to the various parts of creation, to the inorganic and organic, and hence (as I suppose) it is represented, with so much power and effect, by the apostle, as looking forward with earnest and eager desire for "the manifestation of the sons of God," *when those promises shall be fulfilled.*

There are two other passages of Scripture quoted in the Reply, which I must beg leave to notice, but I will do so as briefly as possible. What is said in

Digitized by Google

Gen. i. 28, 30, shows the object for which vegetables were created; but, be it remembered, it does not say that no other kind of food should be used by such animals as required animal food. And that it is exceedingly rash to draw unhesitatingly such an inference from this passage as many, alas! have done, might be readily shown, if necessary, upon purely *physiological* grounds; nay, from the very necessities of the case, as connected with animal life; for, can we forget that "the green herb" is covered with myriads of microscopic insects, who live on it just as much as the ox and the elephant, and that it would be impossible for the latter creatures to eat their daily food without destroying many of the former? Yet death is *death*, whether it be that of the tiny insect or the huge elephant.

Surely the criticism of the Reply on Gen. iii. 14, "Thou art cursed *above* all cattle," &c., is more specious than sound, and is somewhat too slight a foundation to build such a superstructure upon as that which the Reply would seek to raise upon it. Surely the expression, "*above*," so common in Scripture, is rather intended for *excess* than comparison, and may, perhaps, be fairly paraphrased thus,—"*Thou shalt be the most hateful of creatures.*" From what we know of the condition of many of the heathen nations of ancient and modern days, we know it would not be quite safe to argue from Deut. vii. 14, that they were "all *blessed*," because it is said the Israelites were blessed "*above*" them; nor, again, to argue thus, from Judges v. 24,—"Jael was blessed *above* women, therefore every woman (Jezebel, for instance, 2 Kings ix. 34) is blessed, though in an inferior degree."

I shall be very sorry if anything I have now said be considered open to fair objection; all I can say is, that I have written nothing but what I believe the interests of truth demand. Permit me, in conclusion, to respectfully recommend to the careful perusal of such of your readers as may not have seen the very valuable work of Dr. Hitchcock, referred to in the Reply ("The Religion of Geology, and its connected Sciences"), the *third lecture* of that work,—"Death a universal law of organic beings on this globe from the beginning."

I remain, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

A Christian Geologist.

Bushbury Vicarage, Sept. 8, 1852.

Poetry.

HOPE OF DAWN.

"Until the day dawn and the day-star arise."—2 Pet. i. 19.

I.

Till the day dawn,
And the Day-star arise,—
  Father, O keep thy son,
  Thy feeble, faithless one!
  O guide him through the waste,
  Till the long gloom be past.
  It is a night of fear,
  The path is rough and drear;
  Clouds frown, blasts rush along,
  The tempest gathers strong;

Digitized by Google

Strange perils compass me,
Of flood, fire, rock, and sea;
And I, in loneliness,
Would fain still onward press.
O felt and known, but yet unseen, be nigh;
O loved and longed for, hear each hidden sigh;
Leave me not, struggling thus, to faint, to sink, to die.

II.

Till the day dawn,
And the Day-star arise,—
O Saviour, let thy love,
Down-dropping from above,
This withered soul renew
With thy flower-freshening dew!
O never-changing Friend,
My failing steps attend;
Hold thou me up, and so
I shall pass safely through.
Still keep me at thy side,
Thou who for me hast died:
O light me on my way,
My joy, my strength, my stay.
O clasp me closer to thy pierced side,
Thou who for me the death of deaths hast died;
Let not this staggering faith be too, too sorely tried.

III.

Till the day dawn,
And the Day-star arise,—
Spirit of gentle love,
Thou tempest-calming dove,
Come, and within me dwell,
Come, and all gloom dispel.
Most blessed Comforter,
My weary footsteps cheer.
O light and lamp divine,
Upon my midnight shine;
Better than star or moon,
Brighter than day's bright noon,
O let thy joyous ray
Turn all my night to day.
Let not thy silence to the conflict add,
When thou art with me, even my grief is glad;
When thou art absent from me, joy itself is sad.

NOTICE.

All readers of the Journal are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced; also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error; or hasty speech, or sharp unbrotherly disputation.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Digitized by Google

GENERAL INDEX.

Age to Come, the, 253
Apocalypse, the, 166

Church Completed, 348
Correspondence—
  Letter on Probable Creation Place of Angels, 107, 214, 317, 413
  Letter on English and American Views, 102
  Reply to Correspondent at Guernsey, 102

Damascus removed from being a City, 306
Does the Soul sleep? 179
Double Fulfilment of Prophecy, 291

Extracts from—
  Anon., Verbal Inspiration, 212
  Calvin's Institutes, 317
  Evans, Our Citizenship, 212
  Henry, 411
  Howel's Soul at Death, 212
  Justin Martyr, 317
  Knox, the Last Days, 212, 410, 412
  Napier, 411
  Neander's Church History, 316
  Newton, First and Second Resurrection, 316
  Olshausen, 410
  Owen, 316
  Peden, 411
  Romaine, 412
  Rutherford, the Lord's Coming, 212, 412
  Sibbs, 412

Extracts from—
  Sterry, Reign of Christ on Earth, 317
  Usher, 317

Fleming's Christology, 362, 363

Genesis, 17, 130, 267, 360

Hengstenberg on the Revelation, 166, 408

Inscriptions, Sinaitic, 1
Isaiah xxviii., 48

Mede's Works, 376, 377
Morrison's Key to the Scriptures, 362

New Heavens and New Earth, the, 217
Notes on Scripture—
  Deuteronomy viii. 16, 69
    xi. 12, 189
  Psalm viii. 2, 291
    xxxviii., 191
    xxxix., 71
    xl., 72
    xli., 73
    xlii., 74
    xliii., 75
    xliv., 193
    xlv., 194
    xlvi., 197
    xlvii., 198
    xlviii., 198
    xlix., 200

Digitized by Google

Notes on Scripture (*continued*)
Psalm l., 201
li., 286
lii., 288
liii., 289
liv., 289
lv., 290
lvi., 388
lvii., 390
lviii., 391
Isaiah xvii. 1, 306
Zechariah xi., 393
Matthew xvii. 1, 8, 201, 295
xxi. 16, 291
Mark xiii. 32, 37, 76
Acts ii. 17—22, 395
Hebrews i. 4, 297, 399
x. 23, 307

Poetry—A Stranger here, 110
„ How Long? 319
„ Our One Life, 216
„ Hope of Dawn, 415
Prayer in reference to Popery, 213
Primeval Language, the One, 1
Profession of our Faith, 307
Prophecy, Double Fulfilment of, 291

Reviews—Analytical Greek Lexicon, 314
„ Apocalypse Explained, 100
„ „ Interpreted, 98
„ Beauties of the Bible, 312
„ Bloomsbury Lectures, 312
„ Bulwark, the, 99, 314
„ Candlish on Genesis, 210
„ „ Sermon, 208
„ Chalmers' Memoirs, Vol. IV., 311
„ Charity and its Fruits, 207
„ Choice Sentences, by Howels, 206
„ Christian Fireside Library, 311
„ Chronology of Creation, 100
„ Contribution towards an Argument for Inspiration of Scripture, 100
„ Defence of Pre-millennialism, 307
„ De Vicinitate Extremi Judicii, 209

Reviews—Doctrine of Plenary Inspiration, 99
„ Dreadful Signs of Christ's Second Coming, 210
„ Emphatic New Testament, 313
„ Enoch, 206
„ Evans' Memoirs, 207
„ Expository Preacher, 98
„ Faith Triumphant, 100
„ Fleming on the First Resurrection, 311
„ Halcyonia Ecclesiarum, &c., 101
„ Haldane's Memoirs, 310
„ Handbook for the Apocalypse, 99
„ Heasel's England's Church, 408
„ History of the Council of Trent, 312
„ Honest Thoughts on Scripture, 312
„ Howel's Remains, 206
„ Hymns for the Church, 408
„ Ireland's Miseries, 315
„ Jew, the, 313
„ Last Things, the, 308
„ Lectures on Popery, 98
„ Le Palais de Cristal, 97
„ Letters on the Romish Controversy, 99
„ Man's Last History, 315
„ Mission among the Dens of London, 312
„ Notes on the Hebrews, by Pridham, 314
„ „ Psalms, by ditto, 408
„ Pre-millennialism a Delusion, 85
„ Pronouns in the Apocalypse, 405
„ Prophecy Interpreted Literally or Spiritually, 313
„ Psalms, Translated and Explained, 101
„ Remarks on Prophecies relating to the Jews, 210
„ Review, Foreign Evangelical, 313, 407
„ Romanism *versus* Protestantism, 99

Digitized by Google

Reviews—Romanism at Home, 315
„ Scottish Protestant, the, 314
„ Seven Cries from the Cross, 101
„ Sketches of Modern Irreligion, 101
„ Smith on the Cherubim, 312
„ Testimony for the Times, 98
„ Tregelles' History of the Jansenists, 407
„ Trevilian's Examination of the Number 666, 407
„ Tytler's New View of the Apocalypse, 406
„ Vinet's Pastoral Theology, 408
„ Walker's Separate State, 408
„ Waiting, Watching, Looking, 317

Reviews—Willes' Word in Season, 406
„ Winter Night, the, 209
„ Winslow on the Eighth Chapter of Romans, 315
„ Workman's Testimony to the Sabbath, 100
„ Young Mother's First Book, 315

Rome and Babylon, 56, 113, 230, 321
Shekinah, 362
Sinaitic Inscriptions, 1

The Gracious Design, 291
„ Infants' Hosannahs, 69
„ More Excellent Name, 297
„ New Heavens and New Earth, 217
„ Pleasant Land, 189
„ Transfiguration, 201, 295

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
GENESIS.		
i.		17, 130
	6	224
	9—13	220
ii.	21	220
iii.	6	147
v.	2	45
vii.	11—12	31
viii.	16—19	220
ix.	2	229
xii.	3	223
	7	189
xiii.	4—18	189
	10	139
xv.	1—4	188
	12	154, 220
	18—21	144, 189
xvii.	12	220
xviii.	27	137
xxii.		220
xxvi.	24	188
xxviii.	11	188
	12	34
xxx.	1—8	220
xxxvii.		188
xl.	1	188
xlix.	17	386
EXODUS.		
ii.	10	220
xi.	7	226
xii.	41	130
xiv.	29	220
xx.	4	46
xxiii.	25	132
xxix.	37—44	132
	20	73
xxxix.	3	31
	30	49
xl.	33	130
LEVITICUS.		
viii.	6	220
	9	49
xiv.	14	73
xix.	36	287
xxiii.	40	49
xxv.		221
	33	72
NUMBERS.		
xvii.	8	200
xxxi.	23	223
DEUTERONOMY.		
i.	7	144
viii.	16	69
xi.	12	189
xiii.	15	226
xxxii.	11	43
	43	190
xxxiii.	27	30
JOSHUA.		
iii.	16	220
v.	14	130
vii.	6	137
x.	5—14	55
xx.	7	132
xxiv.	2	144
JUDGES.		
v.	28	219
	31	41
xiv.	14	220
xx.	48	226
I SAMUEL.		
i.	3	131
xvi.	12	45
xxviii.	15	182
II SAMUEL.		
v.	17—25	55
xxiii.	4	41
I KINGS.		
iii.	5, 14	188
iv.	21	144
	33	152
xxii.	19	130
II KINGS.		
xxi.	13	54
I CHRONICLES.		
xii.	6	75
xiv.	8—17	55
xxiii.	31	40
II CHRONICLES.		
vii.	11	130
xi.	3	270
xxxii.	31	225
NEHEMIAH.		
iii.	1	132
ESTHER.		
vii.	16	27
JOB.		
v.	17	133
viii.	12	38
xi.	8	32
	9	35
xii.	10	138
xxii.	15—17	218
xxiii.	4	138
xxv.	3	24
xxvi.	8	31
	10	35
	13	22
xxvii.	3	138
xxviii.	6	143
xxxi.	1	280
xxxiii.	14—16	188

Digitized by Google

Chapter. Verse. Page.

xxxiv. 14 138
xxxvi. 27 135
xxxvii. 11—18 31
15 22
xxxviii. 8 35
8—11 221
19 22
28 134
xxxix. 1—12, 19 43
13—26, 27 43
xli. 42
xlii. 6 137

PSALMS.

viii. 40
. 225
xix. 1 39
3 168
4 24
xxiv. 1 20
xxix. 10 218
xxxiii. 6 22
7 35
xxxv. 16 51
xxxvi. 7 44
xxxviii. 191
xxxix. 71
xliv. 193
xlv. 194
2—13 161
14 160
xlvi. 197
xlvii. 198
xlviii. 198
xlix. 200
l. 201
lxv. 6 43
7 35
10 132
lxxii. 8 144
5, 7, 17 225
lxxiv. 16 39
lxxxiv. 11 41
lxxxviii. 179
lxxxix. 29—37 225
xc. 4 30
xci. 13 387
xcv. 4—6 35
5 35
xcvi. 5 18
cii. 7 43
25, 26 217
26 221
ciii. 14 137
21 32, 130
civ. 34
2 22
5 225
6—9 221
19 40
26 42
30 22
33—34 44
cv. 6—11 189
cx. 2 220
cxv. 17 180
cxxi. 6 25
cxxxi. 2 50
cxxxv. 6 43
15 132
cxxxvi. 39
6 31, 35
cxxxvii. 1 144
cxlvi. 4 180
cxlvii. 4 29
10 43
cxlviii. 2 130
3 225
4 41
6 225
7 43
10 43

PROVERBS.

iii. 33 132
vii. 13 283
viii. 25 to 29 31, 35, 221
xxiii. 31 281
xxv. 3 32
xxx. 4 19
17 43

ECCLESIASTES.

iii. 20 137
ix. 4, 5 180
xi. 7 27
xii. 7 137, 138

SONG OF SOLOMON.

i. 4 160
8 161
ii. 4 160
12 43
iv. 7 161
v. 16 161
v. 10 45
vi. 10 41
11 38

ISAIAH.

i. 17 220
ii. 15—17 222
21 225
iv. 1 49
viii. 14 54
15 53
ix. 6, 7 217
x. 5 49
xi. 8 50
xiii. 10 225
xiv. 9—11 181
xxiii. 17, 18 217
xxiv. 18—20 225
xxv. 8 78
6—8 263, 264
xxviii. 6—8 48
9 50
xxix. 9 50
xxx. 26 25
xxxii. 15 22
xxxiii. 19 51
xxxiv. 4 130, 225, 226
9 256
xxxvii. 12 144
xxxviii. 11, 12, 18 180
18, 19 220
xliii. 13 30
xlv. 7 23
xlix. 1 217
li. 3 139
6 217
21 225
liii. 1 50
liv. 9 218
lv. 9 32
lvi. 10, 12 50
lvii. 16 30
20 35
lx. 20 27
lxii. 5 191
lxv. 17 217
lxvi. 22 217
23 40

JEREMIAH.

iii. 17 191
iv. 23 21
v. 22 35
viii. 7 43
x. 10, 13 31

Digitized by Google

Chapter. Verse. Page.

x. 11 . . 18
13 . . 135
xiii. 4 . . 144
xxi. 6 . . 226
xxvii. 6 . . 226
xxxi. 35, 36 . . 225
li. 15 . . 31
62 . . 62
63 . . 63

LAMENTATIONS.

iii. 29 . . 137
iv. 7 . . 45

EZEKIEL.

xiv. 13 . . 69
xxv. 18 . . 226
xxvii. 23 . . 144
xxviii. 13 . . 139
xxix. 1 . . 29
8 . . 226
xxxi. 8, 9 . . 139
xxxii. 21 . . 181
xxxvi. 35 . . 139
xxxvii. 28 . . 191

DANIEL.

ii. 38 . . 226
iv. 19 . . 130
vii. . . 255, 256
3 . . 35
viii. 14 . . 29
16 . . 186
18 . . 154
x. 9 . . 154
xii. 2 . . 78
2, 12, 13 . 264
3 . . 41

HOSEA.

vii. 5 . . 50
xiv. 3 . . 287

JOEL.

ii. 3 . . 139
28 . . 188
iii. 15 . . 225

AMOS.

vi. 1 . . 48

JONAH.

iv. 11 . . 226

Chapter. Verse. Page.

NAHUM.

ii. 10 . . 21

HABAKKUK.

ii. 20 . . 171

ZEPHANIAH.

i. 7 . . 171

HAGGAI.

ii. 21 . . 225

ZECHARIAH.

ii. 13 . . 171
xii. 1 . . 31
10—14 . 258
xiii. 1, 3 . . 258
7, 9 . . 217
xiv. 15 . . 226

MALACHI.

iv. 2 . . 41

ST. MATTHEW.

i. 1 . . 134
20 . . 188
ii. 2 . . 41
v. 45 . . 24
xi. 25 . . 50
xiii. 43 . . 41
xvi. 13 . . 75
xvii. 1—8 . . 201
xviii. 3, 4 . . 50
xix. 28 . 219, 259
xxii. 32 . . 220
xxiv. 29,25,130, 219, 225
38, 39 . . 218
xxvi. 38 . . 74

ST. MARK.

iv. 11, 12 . . 51
x. 6 . . 154
xiii. 25 . . 41

ST. LUKE.

ii. 13 . . 130
xiv. 14 . . 265

Chapter. Verse. Page.

xxi. 25 . . 40
xxii. 53 . . 23
xxiii. 43 . . 139

ST. JOHN.

i. 4 . . 137
51 . . 34
v. 22 . . 219
28, 29 . . 36
viii. 12 . 23, 41
x. 10 . . 138
xii. 27 . . 74
38 . . 50
xiii. 18 . . 73
xiv. 2 . . 164
xv. 9 . . 159
xvii. 9 . . 349
23—26 . 159
xx. 30 . . 130

ACTS.

ii. 19 . . 40
iii. 21 . . 219
xvii. 25 . . 136

ROMANS.

i. 20 . . 19
viii. 2 . . 219
19—22 . 227
20 . . 72
21 . . 224
30 . . 218
ix. 29 . . 131
xi. 15 . . 258
xii. 5 . . 351

I CORINTHIANS.

vi. 2, 3 . . 259
17 . . 351
19 . . 157
x. 1, 2 . . 220
xi. 3, 8, 9 . . 155
7 . . 46
xii. 23 . . 283
xiii. 23 . . 25
xiv. 21 . . 51
xv. 25, 26 . 219, 220
36, 38 . 220, 221
41 . . 41
45 . 136, 138
49 . . 138
54 . 78, 264

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
II CORINTHIANS.		
iv.	6	24
v.	6, 7, 8	185
vi.	14	29
xi.	2	160
xii.	4	139
EPHESIANS.		
i.	10	221
ii.	3	280
	14	351
	21, 22	158
iv.	12	158, 351
	24	46
v.	24	25
	30	161, 351
PHILIPPIANS.		
i.	23	184
iii.	11	265
COLOSSIANS.		
ii.	11, 13	220
	16, 17	222
iii.	10	46
I THESSALONIANS.		
iv.	16, 17	255, 265
II THESSALONIANS.		
i.	7—9	219
	8	257
ii.	1	255
I TIMOTHY.		
ii.	13	155
TITUS.		
iii.	5	220
HEBREWS.		
i.	10, 12	217, 219
ii.		43, 46
	11	161
	13	53
iv.	3, 4	132
	9	133, 222
ix.	4	165
	28	150
x.	5—10	72, 73
xi.	2	19
	7	218
	10	223
	16	164
	19	220
xii.	26	219
xiii.	11, 12	162
JAMES.		
i.	6	35
	13, 15	282
iv.	14	136
v.	4	131
I PETER.		
ii.		25
iii.	3, 4	284
	20, 21	220
II PETER.		
ii.	4	23
iii.	4	219, 224, 257, 259
	5	35
	7, 14	219
	13	223
I JOHN.		
ii.	16	280
JUDE.		
	6	23
	13	4
REVELATION.		
i.	16, 20	41
ii.	7	139, 145
	16	41
iv.	3	38, 45
v.	9, 11	185
	12	159
	13	43
vi.	2	250
	12, 18	225
vii.	11	168
ix.	16	144
x.	2	36
xii.	1	41
	9—14	270
xiii.	8	255
xiv.	7	35
xv.	2	169
	20, 22	270
xvi.	7	32
	8	27
	12	144
xix.	3	256
	7, 8	160
	28	259
xx.	28	258
	6	265
	8	258
	11	219
	13	36
	15	259
xxi.	1	34
	1—5	219
	2	160
	5, 6	130
	11	168
xxii.	2—14	145

MACINTOSH, PRINTER,
GREAT NEW-STREET, LONDON.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
walt,cls v.4

The Quarterly journal of prophecy.

3 1951 002 795 788 9